

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JUNE 10, 1880.

The Week.

THE nomination of General Garfield, as that of a man who, whatever his personal merits or demerits, has had no organized "boom" behind him, has not been put forward by any clique of political speculators or adventurers, has not "sought the Presidency" either by appeals to sectional passions or by long-prepared intrigue, must be considered a triumph for the cause of good government and constitutional and decent politics. This success, even if it meant nothing else, would mean the defeat of a most audacious attempt to substitute government by chicane and favoritism and corruption for government by open discussion and fair voting. It does mean the ruin of the attempt to establish in Washington the Boss system of party management, as created and perfected in New York by Tweed and Kelly. General Garfield has, however, strong "claims" of his own on the nomination drawn from the fact that he has been for many years an industrious member of Congress, who has borne a prominent and able part in the work of legislation, has long had a considerable share in shaping or carrying all measures of importance, whose opinions on the great topics of the day are perfectly well known, and who has, to his honor, refrained steadily from seeking political preferment through such forms of demagoguery as the "waving of the bloody shirt" or "the stirring up of the Brigadiers." That he is by no means an ideal politician, we do not deny. He is too keenly alive to the prejudices of his district, and was too ready in 1876 to play the part of a "Visiting Statesman," to be entitled to a place among public men of the first rank. But such men are rare, and are not apt to be the men to whom conventions turn when "the break" begins. As matters stand, the Republican party may be sincerely congratulated on his nomination. It is very bad news for the Democrats, to whose hands the nomination of either the Silent Man or the Magnetic Man would undoubtedly have given the battle. And in what a position the nomination leaves the Silent Man, after being dragged by Conkling, Cameron, and Logan for weeks and weeks through the mud of their peculiar field of activity! No one who ever rightly estimated the value to the nation of the splendid fame with which he came back from the war, can do otherwise than bitterly mourn the base uses to which he has allowed this paltry clique to put him during the past ten years.

A supposed "claim" of the New York Machine to have the nominating of the Vice-President, after a week's ineffectual effort to establish the absolute right of the majority to the spoils of the Convention, resulted in the choice of General Chester A. Arthur on the first ballot. This may serve to enlist Mr. Conkling to the extent of a single stump-speech for the ticket, and it ought not to silence Mr. Sherman during the campaign, unless he draws a distinction between serving Cornell and serving Arthur. But nothing could better illustrate the hollowness of the civil-service professions which the Convention was shamed into making. The man for the place was clearly Flanagan, of Texas, one of the honestest delegates in the Convention.

Our readers will not expect of us details of the seven days' struggle in the Convention at Chicago, which ended on the thirty-sixth ballot on Tuesday in the giving way of the Blaine column, which never equalled 300, while the Grant column, which never fell below 300, remained steadfast though defeated. Senator Hoar was made temporary and permanent chairman, and presided well; the unit rule was demolished, and the contesting delegates fairly treated—more fairly by the Convention than by the anti-Grant Committee

on Credentials. The historical sense was strong enough in the Convention to compel the adoption of a civil-service plank when introduced independently of the Committee on Resolutions and after their almost unanimous agreement to pocket it. This was one of the chief episodes, enlivened as it was by the candid exclamation of delegate Flanagan, "What are we here for except for the offices?" Another occurred on Friday, when before the report of any of the important committees Conkling introduced a resolution pledging every delegate to support the nominee of the Convention whoever he might be, and, stale as the tactics were, beyond a feeble protest from Hale that it was unnecessary, no one had the courage to vote against it except three West Virginians. The great whipper-in promptly moved the expulsion of these, but they were rescued by Garfield, who doubtless felt that if he did not bell the cat his reputation as a "harmonizer" would suffer. Of course he had the Convention with him, and Conkling was obliged to withdraw his motion.

What the *Times* calls "an imposing gathering of great men" had few to spare for its committees. The most distinguished name on the Committee on Permanent Organization was that of W. J. Whipper, of South Carolina; the only two of national reputation on the Committee on Rules were those of General Garfield and General George H. Sharpe. The lights of the Committee on Credentials were William E. Chandler, Benjamin F. Tracy, John Cessna, and R. C. McCormick; of the Committee on Resolutions, Emory A. Storrs, Wm. Walter Phelps, and Edwards Pierrepont. Among the one hundred and thirty or forty colleagues of these gentlemen doubtless some good and excellent citizens were to be found; but for aught the public at large knows of them their collective signatures appended to a party manifesto would have exactly the weight of their numbers, and nothing beside. And if, as should have been the case, the committees were a favorable sample of the Convention, we may safely set down the number of "great men" in it at the most at fifty.

The scenes of disorder by which the proceedings were twice interrupted, in which both delegates and audience abandoned themselves for nearly half an hour at a time to the savage diversion of yelling and waving hats and other articles of clothing, including women's shawls, as a means of discouraging their opponents, may be said to have been provided for by the arrangement which made eight hundred men sit for deliberative purposes in a building capable of containing ten thousand. Nor do we know that there would be any objection to this in the case of a body which met to do work which was to affect only its own members, and for which they were to be responsible to nobody but themselves. But certainly a convention which meets to select and recommend a candidate for the highest office in the Government to several millions of voters, owes it to these voters to perform its task with sobriety and decency, and to keep up an appearance, at all events, of exemption from all but rational influences. A party made up as the Republican party is, ought not to be asked to accept nominations made in scenes which at times bore a striking resemblance to the preliminaries of a fight in the old days of Donnybrook Fair. The comparison with Bedlam which they have suggested to some of our contemporaries is hardly fair to Bedlam, because the lunatics in that institution were never, according to the best testimony, let loose in numbers anything approaching those of the Convention. We trust that hereafter the committee of arrangements will have regard enough for that portion of the party which does not attend the convention to provide less accommodation for "the gallery."

The rôle played by Mr. Conkling in the Convention was strikingly indicative of the extent to which the party management

has lost its hold on ideas and principles, and become a huge engine for the division of offices. He could not have been as prominent and powerful as he was in any assembly which was really deliberative, and in which any real work of persuasion had to be done. His bearing, too, was curiously like that of the Bonapartist henchmen in the Corps Législatif, and as little as possible American. The praise of his chief, as somebody above all laws and constitutions, and a good substitute for all other machinery of government; the cuts and jibes he directed against the other candidates, and against all critics or opponents of his own; his failure to connect Grant in any way with the party which had elected him and was to elect him, if nominated, or to give it any thanks for his greatness; the pert insolence with which he sought to throw contempt on the dissentients in his own delegation every time he announced the vote, until Mr. Campbell, of West Virginia, had the courage to rebuke him by mimicry—were all a remarkable reproduction of the tactics of Count de Morny when presiding over his master's mock legislature in Paris, and as unlike as possible to anything hitherto seen or submitted to in American politics.

Mr. Conkling's nominating speech in the Convention was the first attempt we have seen to set out General Grant's claims to the Presidency. His other supporters who have written or talked on the subject have generally contented themselves with saying that there was no objection to a third term, and that "if the people wanted him they would have him." Mr. Conkling said in substance that the candidate came "from Appomattox"; that he alone could carry the doubtful States at the North; that he is "the most illustrious of living men"; that "he has studied the needs and defects of many systems of government"; that he "never betrayed a cause or a friend," and that the various charges against him have "strengthened and seasoned his hold on the popular heart"; that he "single and alone overthrew expansion and cleared the way for specie resumption"; that "to him more than any other man" we owe it that "every paper dollar is as good as gold"; that "life and liberty will find a safeguard in him," or, in other words, we suppose, that under him there will be no need of courts and legislatures; and, finally, that the only argument against him—the third-term argument—"would amaze Solomon." A better Bonapartist speech was never delivered in France, and, in fact, the candidate was presented as a person fully competent to take entire charge of the Government in all its branches. The charges against his Administration, too, were treated exactly as a sovereign treats charges—that is, as things which it is beneath his dignity to notice, or, in Mr. Conkling's words, as shafts and arrows aimed at him, "which lie broken at his feet."

In spite of the universal interest centring in Chicago, the seat of government has remained at Washington, and the proceedings at the national Capitol have not been destitute of importance. The House has made another offer to adjourn to-day, but the date is still too early. It passed on Thursday the General Deficiency Appropriation Bill, after a characteristic wrestling with the silver problem. Some recognition had to be made of Secretary Sherman's request for more storage, and the bill appropriated \$20,000 for that purpose. Mr. Bland wanted all the amounts appropriated in the act and the full amount of Congressmen's salaries paid in silver, and was willing to allow \$10,000 for the storage of so much as might be returned into the Treasury in exchange for silver certificates. Mr. Townshend wanted all Federal salaries paid in silver; Mr. Warner, all "Government expenses and obligations" paid in gold or silver coin without discrimination or favor, but without waiving the "right of option"—of course to pay in the baser metal. In the end the original proposition was adopted, and \$20,000 more were sacrificed to the "Ohio idea." The bill also contains a provision that no part of the appropriation for marshals and their deputies shall be used in payment of services rendered at any election. On Saturday the House passed the Senate bill authorizing a joint committee to consider the question of increasing the accommodations

of the Library of Congress within the Capitol, or of selecting a site for it outside; and on Monday, another tardy and perilously urgent measure—the Senate bill confirming the Ute agreement, but with amendments of an obstructive character.

The Senate's achievements have been the passage of the River and Harbor Appropriation Bill and Mr. Eaton's Tariff Commission Bill. Further debate on the latter measure did not add much to the general edification, but revealed more fully the fact that its chief opponents were the *ad captandum* tinkers, who think there is no need of a commission to indicate certain immediate and sweeping improvements in the present tariff, and who ignorantly rant about the poor man's being taxed for his tea and coffee. They were, too, all or nearly all Democrats, including Messrs. Beck, Thurman, and Davis of Illinois. There was an unpartisan yet firm majority for keeping this commission out of politics by excluding Congressmen from it; but they were unable to prevent an absurd amendment ordering a final report in January next. Nothing could better illustrate the average legislator's idea of the ease of statistical enquiry. However, if the commission makes a beginning, doubtless it will not be hard to get an extension.

As much as one per cent. was bid in Wall Street during the week for the privilege of buying gold, at any time within one year, at par in lawful money. This means that the bidders believe that the difference between the bullion value of the silver dollar and the gold dollar will show itself in the domestic markets within a year. To do this the foreign exchanges must rule against the United States to an extent sufficient to draw hence a large amount of gold. When the gold dollars thus disappear the silver dollars will be forced into circulation. They will pass within the bounds of the United States at their legal-tender value, which is one hundred cents; but outside of the country they will be taken, as now, only for their bullion value, which of late has ranged between 87 and 89 cents; and the gold dollars will be worth more for use out of the country because of their larger bullion value, although their legal-tender value will of course remain the same as that of the silver dollar. The future value of the Treasury-note dollar, worth to-day 100 cents, because it is yet possible to get a gold dollar for it at the Treasury, will depend on two things—first, the kind of coin (whether gold or silver) with which the Treasury will pay it, and, second, on its prompt redemption by the United States Treasury. The value in the markets of the world of the silver dollar depends, of course, on the London price of silver bullion, expressed in gold prices. When anything happens (like unfavorable foreign exchanges sufficient to draw large amounts of gold from the country) to substitute in our own markets the bullion for the legal-tender value of the silver dollar, it follows that there will be what is called a premium on gold as compared with silver dollars, just as, before the resumption of specie payments, there was a premium on gold as compared with Treasury legal-tender notes; and it is in anticipation of this happening within a year that Wall-Street speculators are willing to pay for the privilege of "calling" gold at par—or, in other words, of exchanging silver dollars for gold dollars at the legal-tender value of each.

At the Stock Exchange there was a very decided reaction from the depression of the last few weeks, and the prices of stocks recovered from 1 to 15 per cent. This reaction was owing partly to the fact that speculation had gone too far on the "bear side," and partly to the fact that railroad earnings still are and are likely to continue very large, so far as the trunk-line rates contribute thereto, the managers of the trunk-lines having had another harmonious meeting. The money market was very easy for borrowers, although the banks added but little to their surplus reserve. Foreign exchange ruled near the gold-exporting point, but no gold was shipped. General trade continues to show a reactionary tendency from the extreme activity of the early part of the year, and mercantile failures are becoming more frequent. The crop prospects for this

country are very encouraging. Silver bullion closed at 52½d. per oz., and the bullion value of the "buzzard dollar" here was \$0.8875.

Mr. Gladstone, Lord Granville, and Lord Hartington have all three spoken in Parliament on foreign affairs. Mr. Gladstone denied that the Liberals when in opposition had assailed the Treaty of Berlin generally. What they complained of was that it was not executed and that it did not go far enough, and he declared it to be the intention of the present Cabinet to disabuse the Turks of the notion, which they had got from the course of the last Cabinet, that England was so deeply interested in the preservation of the Ottoman Empire that they could in the last resort always count on her support. But he wished also to rid the Turks of the notion that England wished to destroy Turkish sovereignty in Asia Minor. Lord Granville explained in what points the Treaty of Berlin had been left unexecuted by the Porte, calling particular attention to the failure to institute the stipulated reforms in Armenia, and announced that the Government had come to the conclusion that the only remedy was to be found in vigorous and concerted action on the part of the great Powers. As to what would happen afterwards, he had pointed out to the Turkish ambassador the extreme danger to Turkey of her failure to fulfil the obligations imposed on her by the Treaty, and desired him to warn his Government that if their counsels were disregarded, they would not fail to enforce them. Lord Hartington gave up the treaty of Gundamuck as dead, and said the Indo-Afghan boundary would hereafter be settled without any reference to it, and that Kandahar would probably be erected into an independent state under British protection, but without a British garrison. There will probably be no attempt made to keep a British envoy at Kabul. All the best Indian authorities are agreed that the news of what was going on among the natives could not be half as well obtained through such an officer as through the native "news-writers," generally Persians. These men pursue the trade which flourished in England in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, of making up letters of metropolitan gossip for those at a distance who can pay for them. They have long supplied the Indian press with the Persian, Afghan, and Central Asiatic news, and during all the late troubles in Afghanistan their letters were generally, we believe, found more trustworthy than the Government despatches. For instance, they sent word to India that General Roberts would be attacked by Mohammed Jan, when the general was flattering himself that all resistance was over.

The Ministry is, however, by no means having an easy time. The resistance about Sir Bartle Frere's recall, which seemed to have subsided, has revived, and, though it is not to take the form of a direct motion, the vote of his salary is to be resisted by at least eighty Liberal members in the debate on the estimates. The case against him will be found set out fully elsewhere in our review of Miss Colenso's book. The worst of it is that if the Cabinet quails before this revolt it will probably lead to others, and through them to that disorganization of the majority, through internal dissensions, which the Tories have always predicted, and on which they now count. We cannot help believing, however, that the present discontents are simply a passing expression of the disappointment which was sure to follow the tremendous hopes excited by the magnitude of the Liberal victory, and will disappear before the end of the session.

Mr. Goschen has been received by the Sultan, and has, by request, presented him with a memorandum containing the demands of the Powers, which are simply that he should execute the Treaty of Berlin as regards Greece and Montenegro and carry out reforms all over the Empire. The Sultan has replied, in substance, that he is much obliged to him and will think the matter over seriously. Of course, it is hardly anticipated that the Sultan will do anything in the matter, and therefore it seems to have been settled, or all but settled, that, after giving him a reasonable time for thought,

there will be a conference of the Powers, at which Turkey will not be represented, which will decide what further action is to be taken. One thing will probably be done at once, by concert between the ambassadors at Constantinople, and without waiting for the more formal conference, and that is organize a commission, to be protected by a sufficient force, to trace the boundary between Turkey and Greece. The Montenegrin difficulty will have to be dealt with somewhat differently. There the boundary is traced, but the Albanians have occupied the territory ceded to the Montenegrins, and may have to be expelled by force; and the question will be whether the Powers will make Turkey supply this force or supply it themselves. However, according to present appearances, force may not be necessary, as the Albanian resistance seems to be collapsing, partly owing to the outbreak of dissensions between the Catholic and Mussulman tribes, and partly to that more potent influence, the exhaustion of their funds and supplies. Mr. Goschen appears, during his stay at Vienna, to have assured Baron Haymerle that to England the preservation of the Turkish Empire was not a paramount consideration; that what she sought above all things was the execution of reforms. But the Baron declared Austria was not ready to take this advanced ground, and that Turkey was just as dear to Austria as Bulgaria or Rumelia.

Prince Bismarck has received another serious check in the rejection by the Committee of the first section of the New Church Bill, which proposes to allow the Government to exercise its discretion in the matter of prohibiting the appointment to parishes of priests who are foreigners, or who have not taken the required university course in Germany. The whole bill has been opposed by Dr. Falk, under whom, when in office, the laws which it is proposed to modify were passed, and it is by the greater part of the National Liberals considered a distinct step in retrogression. But, besides the objections to the bill on its merits, there are objections to it perhaps not less powerful as a part of Prince Bismarck's new policy, which his recent speech, in the Reichstag, after ten weeks' absence, was not calculated to remove. He made it in the character of a weary and sick man, who had built up the German Empire, and was addressing persons who ought to be as much attached to it and as proud of it as he, but who were somehow apparently working for its overthrow; and he warned them that if they were not more careful he would resign and leave them and it to their fate. This tone does not seem to succeed at present.

Rochefort seems not unlikely to have at last been overtaken by an appropriate fate, being in danger of death from a wound received in a duel. He has been living in Geneva since his escape from New Caledonia, but keeps in Paris a son, a lad of seventeen, who seems to be a chip of the old block, and to love a row in the streets. The latter accordingly took part in a fray caused, a few weeks ago, by a Communist demonstration, which the police had to suppress, and received more or less mauling, but was not injured seriously. His veracious father thereupon wrote a letter to the Prefect of Police, M. Andrieux, accusing him of having had the son "sabred" by the police in order to gratify his hatred of the father, and threatening when he saw him to slap his face, adding, with thorough Rochefort absurdity, that nothing better could be expected of a person whose brother-in-law had murdered a man in an unfair duel. Koechlin, the brother-in-law, thereupon promptly stepped forward and arranged "a meeting" with Rochefort, and being only twenty-nine, a good fencer, and of fine physique, while Rochefort is over forty and fat, he got under his guard and gave him a few inches of cold steel in the stomach. The story about the sword accidentally dropping from Rochefort's hand is probably concocted to save his reputation as a fighting man. There is nothing, as we said when he was in this country, at all remarkable in Rochefort's career. He is a smart and unscrupulous "newspaper man," of the third or fourth order, with an immense capacity for telling amusing lies, and probably in any country but France would never have been heard of out of the café he frequented.

THE REPUBLICAN CONVENTION.

THE long delay of the Chicago Convention in making the nomination has, of course, been due to the fact that the main interest of the body was centred in the contest between the rival aspirants to the office, none of whom is in any special manner identified with any principle or policy. The Convention itself was not dominated by any idea of magnitude or importance, or eager to carry into execution any prevailing sentiment. It was not swept by any of the enthusiasm which in 1856 and 1860 and 1864 marked the initiation of one of the greatest political revolutions of modern times. In those years the platform was everything, because it expressed the high hopes, the noble fears, and the unconquerable determination before which slavery was eventually to go down and the Union to be reorganized on a new and better basis. In 1868 the country was still shaken by the throes of the civil war, and doubtful as to the possibility of saving the fruits of so much blood and so many tears; and the man who had brought the war to a successful issue seemed plainly marked out for the task of assuring to it the peace and order for which it had struggled so long and endured so much. In that year, therefore, the platform was not of much importance and the candidate was of great importance, and was happily presented to the Convention almost by the force of events. In 1876 the situation had changed. About the permanence of the settlement which the war had made there was no longer any doubt. There was for all practical purposes everywhere complete acquiescence in its results. Industry had revived; speculation on an immense scale occupied the national mind; the taxation was more than sufficient to meet all the public burdens. But it was plain to be seen that the war had enormously enlarged the administrative machinery of the Government, and that during the long distraction of the national mind from the things of peace huge abuses had sprung up in nearly every department, which made investigation and reform emphatically the most pressing duty of the party in power. In that year, therefore, the candidate was clearly of minor importance; the platform, as containing the intentions of the party in the matter of putting the country on a sound basis, by revision of the tariff and reorganization of the immense civil service created by the war, by the reform of the currency and a return to specie payments, was of supreme importance. The war being fairly over, and the military leader who directed it returning to private life, the Republican party, which had conducted the war, was fairly called on to furnish the country with some indications of its competency to take charge of its peaceful and industrial interests, and those indications were of course to be found, if anywhere, in the platform. In brief, the party in 1876 took, or ought to have taken, what is called a new departure. It is, therefore, worth while to recall what it proposed to do in 1876, as distinguished, of course, from what it boasted of having done, and to compare it with what it has just proposed at Chicago. In doing so it is but fair to observe that it has not in the interval had possession of Congress, so that it is not to be held responsible for the continued existence of many of the abuses which it denounced in 1876. The comparison will, therefore, be mainly useful as a means of ascertaining and marking the drift of party sentiment, and the amount of reliance to be placed in party promises should the Republicans again come into possession of both branches of the Government.

In 1876 there was an act on the statute-book pledging the Government to resume specie payments in 1879. The Convention in dealing with the financial question called for the redemption of United States notes in coin at the earliest possible date, "by a continuous and steady progress towards specie payments"; but a resolution pledging the party to redemption on the day already fixed by statute was voted down, showing that it was not prepared to take any definite ground about the finances at all. Curiously enough, this evasive attitude towards the subject seems to be still maintained. Since 1876 the financial problem has been seriously complicated by the passage of the Silver Bill, so that we are now threatened with a forced cessation of resumption in gold and with

the substitution of a silver for a gold or a mixed standard, and of a consequent fall of about twelve per cent. in the value of the greenbacks. It is still further complicated by the fact that the future of the greenbacks remains covered with uncertainty, and neither party has taken any ground upon the very serious proposal, which the continuance of the greenbacks in circulation impliedly makes, that the Government shall assume the novel and, as it seems to many, dangerous functions of a bank of issue. The Chicago Convention, however, while boasting of the rise of Government paper to "the par of gold" makes no mention whatever of the difficulties which threaten the continuance of this par, and makes no suggestion whatever about the silver question any more than if it did not exist.

A plank in 1876 laid down with much emphasis the doctrine that Senators and Representatives should not interfere with appointments, and that the tenure of non-political offices should be dependent on good behavior. All allusion to the subject was this year left out by the Committee, and a civil-service reform plank was only inserted through the vigorous remonstrance of Mr. Codman, a Massachusetts delegate, and after some resistance and with some marks of contempt. The demand of 1876, that no public money shall be voted for sectarian schools, is this year repeated, and made more definite by a proposal that the practice shall be prohibited by an amendment to the Federal Constitution. The demand of 1876 for "incidental protection" to American industry through the tariff is also repeated, but not a word is said of the need of any reform or revision of the tariff, which still bears all the marks of the haste and confusion with which it was first drawn up at the outbreak of the war, and is in most respects discreditable to us as a civilized people. The denunciation of 1876 of further land-grants and subsidies to corporations and private persons is repeated; so is the denunciation of polygamy; so is the promise to pay the pensions of the soldiers and sailors. But the promise of "respectful consideration" for the woman suffragists is not repeated, and, in fact, the claims of this interesting and energetic body of persons are entirely ignored. On the other hand, the suggestion of 1876 that Congress should investigate the effect of "Mongolian" immigration has this year grown into a demand that the treaty-making power of the Government should be used to "restrain and limit" such immigration. The "arraignment of the Democrats" is very much what it was in 1876. In this part of the platform the evasiveness and reserve and caution of the other parts of the platform are always thrown aside, and the drafters express their full thoughts in as plain and simple language as they can command. We do not gather from this year's platform that the Democrats are any wickeder than they were in 1876, but the list of their crimes is, of course, somewhat enlarged, and the danger of letting them have any offices is made more conspicuous.

We have here noticed everything in the platforms of both years which can be called a promise or a recommendation or a demand. The rest is simple boasting—a "pointing with pride," as it is called—about things with some of which the connection of the party is very remote indeed, as the construction of 51,000 miles of railroad between 1860 and 1874, largely with the money of unfortunate private individuals who lost a large part of it. It will be seen at a glance that the party has, in so far as the managers speak for it, actually, within the past four years, curtailed rather than enlarged the sphere of its duties and responsibilities. The reason is plain enough. It has not had it in its power to legislate, but it has had it in its power to discuss, to ventilate, to educate the voters into interest in and devotion to great questions. From anything of this kind, however, the leaders have sedulously refrained. The first two years of the present Presidential term they passed in denouncing and intriguing against President Hayes, and trying to bully or cajole him into surrendering his Cabinet into their hands and abandoning such efforts as he was making to reform the Administration. Since they gave this up in despair they have occupied themselves exclusively in perfecting

their respective Machines, with the view of obtaining control of the Convention which has just met. We can recall no period of four years in which the political leaders on both sides have done so little of their proper work of preparing public opinion to express itself through elections on questions of real national importance. The result is that the Convention has been wholly, or almost wholly, occupied in providing precautions, through procedure, against the success of intrigues on one side or another, which the friends of the candidates have been for over a year carefully preparing, and in making preparations for a final struggle between two of these candidates to whom the most intelligent and reflective portion of the party was well known to be opposed, and neither of whom was in any degree identified with any cause, principle, or idea of which it is now considered either the guardian or exponent.

THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE BLACKS.

THE negro "exodus," as it is called, has at last been enquired into and reported upon, though not fully; that is to say, the Democratic majority of the Senate Committee have summoned and examined one hundred and fifty-nine witnesses, who have given, on the whole, a very favorable account of the negro's condition at the South. But in order to procure this gratifying testimony they used the whole, or nearly the whole, of the appropriation, and left nothing for the minority to pay for a dismal account of it; so that we apparently shall not have the reverse of the picture from any official source. It does not, however, really make much difference, as there is no reason to suppose that the Republican witnesses would supply anything beyond accounts of election outrages, of the occurrence of which about election time, in certain States, we suppose no reasonable man on either side has any doubt. All the testimony taken, and all testimony of every kind which has fallen under our notice during the past four years, from whatever source, goes to confirm the view of the condition of the negro at the South which we have all along taken in these columns, and we would fain believe that with the substantial success of the "exodus" the subject will pass out of politics. A strong probability that the negro would have a hard time after the war was created both by the two great facts that he had been newly emancipated against the wishes of his white owners and neighbors, and that the society into which his emancipation introduced him was by no means what is called at the North a "law-abiding society." Any white man introduced into such a society in such a way would have found life very insecure and unpleasant. Any black man was *a fortiori* sure to find it insecure and unpleasant. That it was not even more insecure and unpleasant for the negro than it proved to be, was due simply to the tremendous depression brought on the whites by the war. The young white men were dead or maimed when the negro began to go about free, and the old white men were weary and dispirited. But for this it is very certain that the abolitionist accounts of the demoralizing effects of slavery both on blacks and whites would have received more confirmation from events than they did. For most assuredly no one who reads and believes the descriptions of Southern society on its moral side with which the anti-slavery agitation was fortified and pushed, and then looks at the wonderful peace and quiet with which that society at the South has become free and industrial, can avoid the conclusion that the war was a necessary preparation for the transformation. It must be confessed, too, that carpet-baggery was not without its uses in making the transformation easy. The whites were aided in accepting negro equality as a fact by being ruled and robbed by the negroes under Federal superintendence. It was not by any means a wholesome experience for the negroes, but it brought home to the whites in a way in which nothing else could have done the fact that the negro was really their equal in the eye of the law, and had powerful friends behind him, who would see that even as a robber he should not fare worse than a white man.

Since the carpet-bag period the society at the South has been, in all States in which the negroes are not in a majority, almost

exactly what it is in all countries in which labor is plentiful, and the laborer poor and ignorant, and the employer short of money. If the plantations are worked on shares, and the planter keeps a running account with the laborer, the latter gets the worst of the bargain in various ways at the South, just as he gets the worst of it under similar circumstances everywhere else. There is probably no more prolific source of cheating or overreaching all the world over than the payment of wages in kind; and the negro suffers from it at the South, as the Irishman, and Englishman, and German, and Chinaman, and Coolies suffer from it, not because he is black but because he does not know how to keep accounts, and is improvident and unthrifty. The current account at the store, of which the Southern negroes complain much, is probably the worst burden he has to bear, because it not simply runs him into debt for goods purchased at exorbitant rates, but in many or most cases puts his growing crop into the hands of the creditor as a pledge, with the power of sale at such dates as the creditor may select. But here again the negro is paying a penalty of ignorance and improvidence and poverty from which his class suffers in all countries. The country storekeeper at the South is simply the equivalent of the village usurer in Ireland and in India. In both these countries the presence of the man who advances money or goods at exorbitant rates of interest or profit, and secures himself by liens on the land and the growing crops, and is ready to renew the loan as long as the security holds out, forms a difficulty in the way of perpetuating small landholding by which all legislators have been thus far puzzled. He has in India, among a population much thriftier and more industrious than the negroes, become an evil of the first magnitude, with which the Government is now going to make a desperate effort to deal. The problem is, of course, extremely difficult, as it consists in nothing less than saving many millions of free men from the consequences of their own folly in the management of their own affairs, without undue interference with their liberty. As matters stand the land of India is fast passing into the hands of the money-lenders and the legal owners becoming mere peons, working without hope for a bare subsistence and for the benefit of creditors who can never be satisfied. That the system should make its appearance in the South as soon as there appeared on the soil a very poor and ignorant population of laborers and small farmers, was what every economical observer would have predicted.

The remedy for it is the one to which the negroes themselves have resorted, to which the Irish resort, but which the Indian ryot is too conservative, and too closely tied to the soil by custom and tradition, to think of—emigration. The negro has doubtless been, in some degree, incited into it, as the Senate Committee maintain, by politicians telling him the story of his own wrongs. We think it not unlikely that many, if not most, of the negroes at the South had no idea how badly off they were until they heard of it from politicians seeking to make political capital for use at the North. Very likely, too, railroad agents or Kansas land speculators have spread wonderful stories, and supported them with chromos, of the luxurious reception which awaits the colored emigrant in Kansas and Indiana. But there is no more harm in bringing these agencies to bear on negroes than on Irishmen or Englishmen, on whom, also, they have been freely used. It is, probably, not easy to get a very ignorant man of any race to move from any place in which he has been born and bred without in some way kindling his imagination about the place he is going to, and in doing this there is invariably a good deal of exaggeration, to use a very mild term. But it must be remembered that the employers and landlords and creditors who see poor men going off in droves to seek to better their fortunes elsewhere, invariably assume that they have been put up to it by mendacious speculators and demagogues. This is as true of the Dorsetshire farmer or the Irish landlord as of the Southern planter or storekeeper. All such talk is of little moment, and would nowhere repay parliamentary enquiry. It has been investigated here, mainly owing to the regrettable importance of the Southern negro as "capital" to the Republican party at the North during the last ten

years. When the negro began to remove, his removal was hailed as ample justification for "waving the bloody shirt," and when produced as such justification the Democrats went to work to show that the emigration was wholly the result of political machinations. Neither story was true. The negro is not as badly off as Republican politicians would have us believe; but he is not as well off as Southern politicians would like to persuade us. Nor is it to be taken as settled that the old Slave States are the best places for the colored people to work out their fortunes in, even if born and bred there. They have bettered their condition by leaving Africa, and it is very likely they will benefit it by leaving the South. As a general rule, the best place for a poor man is the place in which labor is in most demand and is paid for in *cash*, and in which the market for the produce of the small farmer is most accessible. If this be true, there is hardly any Northern State in which an enterprising and industrious negro would not be better off than at the South. The shiftless and lazy would probably, owing to the difference of manners and of the climate, be worse off; but it is hardly worth our while to vex ourselves as to what becomes of the latter.

It must be observed, finally, that the massing of the blacks in South Carolina, Mississippi, and Louisiana is a positive misfortune for both races in these States. It gives a ferocious bitterness to political differences, and keeps the State constantly exposed to a danger which can only be, or at all events only is, guarded against by gross electoral cheating or intimidation; and this supplies the annual crop of "frauds" and "outrages" which exercise such a very injurious influence on national politics at the North. Besides this, whatever the future may have in store for it, it is certain that the negro race has not yet displayed much inherent capacity for social and political advancement when withdrawn from all extraneous influences. Dense masses of colored people, therefore, removed from the influences of white ideas and usages and opinions, such as are to be found in the States we have named, are very likely to become centres of barbarism or retrogression, from which both the States and the nation at large must suffer. It is for the best interests of both that the negro population should be more widely diffused. When it is, the "negro problem" will cease to give any trouble and will disappear from politics, and the negro himself be delivered from that most demoralizing condition of a victim with plenty of good people to wall over him and pump him for stories of wrongs, in which so strong an effort is now made to keep him. The reception which he finds for "outrages" is, in fact, cordial enough to convert even a religiously brought-up white man into an arrant impostor, and it is greatly to the credit of the colored race that they have not made the scenes of slaughter which some of them describe more numerous and ghastly.

PARLIAMENTARY WEAKNESS IN FRANCE.

PARIS, May 26, 1880.

WE cannot conceal the fact that the majority of the Chamber of Deputies has shown but little political ability at the beginning of the summer session. On the 13th of May last they nearly overthrew the ministry of M. de Freycinet, without intending to do so, but accidentally, as one may break a porcelain vase. It would be idle to attempt to deny that under existing circumstances the overthrow of the present Cabinet would have had most serious consequences, for a ministry composed of the Extreme Left would be impossible; it would be in such flagrant opposition to the Senate that it would necessitate the dissolution of the Chamber, when the country would be convulsed by the struggle of contending factions.

It was about an unimportant article of the Public Meetings Bill that the crisis was nearly brought about. In order to explain the disadvantages of our political situation, I think it necessary to state the reasons which render the majority so difficult to govern. First, then, it is unquestionable that the majority of deputies have evinced certain unfortunate tendencies, such as errors of judgment, and irregularities of political conduct. They are too eager to carry out reforms in our legislative domain. The right which every deputy has of introducing bills has been greatly abused. The Chamber is beset by all sorts of propositions concerning the different branches of our political or social organization.

They have not known how to choose between the most pressing reforms and those which can be deferred; not only is precious time thus lost, but subjects of conflict unexpectedly arise with the ministers, who, on being presented with these hastily prepared bills, are obliged to resist such improvised innovations as seem dangerous to them. The same precipitate spirit characterizes the way they set about the most indispensable reforms, which are alike incumbent on the Chamber and the country. The results are two serious difficulties: first, the Chamber provokes the resistance of the Senate, without whose vote no motion can be definitively passed, and thus, having undertaken too much, they are debarred from advancing a step. They could have effected partial progress, but they wished, at once, to carry out considerable reforms. Hence they have gained nothing, and their fine projects will sleep in the catacombs where those still-born bills are deposited which cannot pass through the ordeal of double deliberation. Besides, supposing these noisy reforms were voted by both Houses, the country would be but ill prepared to receive them and they would not take root.

An example will illustrate one of the objectionable sides of this innovating, radical method. There is before the Chamber of Deputies a very important bill on primary instruction. The Government asked that they should be content with two reforms, for which opinion is ripe both in the Senate and the country, and which are very considerable, since their aim is to make primary instruction gratuitous and compulsory. Still, the Republican party, and with reason, wishes to institute secular instruction, so that the public schools may be open to all citizens without favoring any particular Church. This third reform is not yet generally accepted, as are the other two, and if it is added to them it will cause the bill to founder in the Senate, so that the first two urgent reforms will be postponed indefinitely because the Republican party cannot forego the pleasure of setting forth their principles. Hitherto the majority of the deputies have not swerved from that absolute and chimerical policy whose maxim is "all or nothing." The other day M. Louis Blanc, the famous democrat, declared from the tribune that he preferred the postponement of a law, however excellent, rather than to forego the attainment of an absolute ideal. This dangerous and sterile impatience, however, is only imputable to an ardent minority. If our deputies were consulted individually, most of them would complain of such wrong-headedness even after having pledged their votes to these intemperate partisans.

We may find the cause of the pressure so many reasonable men endure in the origin of the Chamber of Deputies itself. It was elected, as you know, after the alarming crisis of May 16, 1877—a *coup d'état* which failed. As the danger then was great, all the Republican forces were obliged to coalesce in order to confront the enemy. The consequence is a habit of separating themselves as little as possible, even when victory declares itself for them, and of maintaining what is called the union of the Left to the utmost of their power. As always happens in similar situations, the most ardent have the preponderance, because they are the most passionate and noisy. It is to be hoped that at the next elections the different fractions of the Republican party may recover their independence, and that the wise and prudent, by grouping together, may counterbalance the impatience and temerity of radicalism. We must also acknowledge that our mode of election is defective; the districts are sometimes too small: petty local influences have too much weight, and send to the Chamber too many mediocre men, who are what we designate as "cocks of the village." The smaller a constituency is, the greater is its hold on its representatives. We need, therefore, to give our entire approval to the project of extending the electoral basis by substituting the departmental ballot for the district (*arrondissement*) ballot. We shall thus more easily escape mediocrity in the deputies and servility towards the electors, those two scourges of inexperienced universal suffrage.

There is yet another cause of the unfortunate state of the French parliamentary world, and one which prevents each successive ministry from wielding the natural authority becoming to the leaders of the majority: the man who really possesses the power will not assume the responsibility of it. The true political chief is M. Gambetta; he has chosen the honorary post of President of the Chamber of Deputies. Thence he rules, but from behind the scenes. I will describe in one of my next letters the actual rôle of the great republican orator in the politics of the day. It is high time to put an end to this precarious state of the Republican Government, which reminds us somewhat of the Italian Left. The lesson which the latter has just received at the recent elections, from which it came out much weakened, deserves to be pondered in France, for the Right here do not accept our institutions as final, as they do in Italy. They wish to

destroy them, and their success would be full of peril to the present régime. They have shown themselves disposed to profit by every division of the Left, and in the last debates they voted with the Extreme Left. This is not the first time monarchists have been seen to urge on political exaggeration, and the present tactics of the so-called party of order reminds one of a curious episode in the history of our great Revolution. During the month Prairial, in the year III., when the terrible invasion of the National Convention occurred, the President, Boissy d'Anglas, an ex-noble, at the moment he was assailed by the mob in the chair he occupied with such unshaken courage, saw a man wearing a red cap, whom he had remarked as one of the most active fomenters of the riot, approach him and say: "Well, marquis, do you find this hot enough?" On looking at him closely he recognized a fellow-nobleman who had formerly been his friend, whose object in exciting the rioters to the utmost violence was evidently to disgust the country with the new constitution. This marquis is still in existence; he is to be found amongst the Right, and republicans would do well never to forget him when they are tempted to overstep the limits assigned by prudence. E.

Correspondence.

EX POST FACTO.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Mr. Conkling's resolutions offered at Chicago on Friday, aside from showing a general purpose to intimidate the Convention, illustrate another of his peculiar ideas. The first resolution, viz.:

"Resolved, as the sense of this Convention, that every member of it is bound in honor to support its nominee, whoever that nominee might be, and that no man should hold his seat here who is not ready so to agree,"

was carried by a vote of 716 to 3. He then offered the following:

"Resolved, that delegates who have voted they will not abide by the action of the Convention do not deserve to vote, and have forfeited their votes in the Convention,"

which he afterwards withdrew, "as there was some doubt" as to the dissenters' position. Passing over the assumption that those who voted not to expel bolters were themselves bolters, and admitting that the first resolution obtained the force of law, it could only operate forwards from the declaration of the vote, and not backwards. But Mr. Conkling's doctrine is that voting against a proposed rule is violating the rule, if it chance to carry. When, then, does he suppose that the resolution began to have the force of law? Apparently when it was conceived in the recesses of his "peerless intellect"—a very natural idea for a believer in personal government. M.

CAMBRIDGE, June 4.

DR. DEXTER AND HIS ASSAILANTS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the spring of 1876 I published a little book of less than 150 pages, entitled 'As to Roger Williams and His "Banishment" from the Massachusetts Plantation; with a few further words concerning the Baptists, the Quakers, and Religious Liberty: a Monograph.' In due course of time it received the careful, and in some cases extended, notice of some of the ablest critical journals of the day, with results remarkably favorable to its general quality. The *Boston Advertiser*, *Springfield Republican*, *Providence Journal*, *Christian Register*, and *New York Independent* were among this number. The veteran critic of the *New York Tribune* gave it marked commendation; so did the *North American*, the *International*, and *Scribner's Monthly*, while the *Nation* declared its weighty opinion that the author "appears fully to have established" his general positions.

I recount these facts because of the singular zeal—sometimes deepening and darkening into something very like ferocity—with which a few hostile critics have pursued the volume and its author. That I may not be suspected of over-statement as to this I append a few exact quotations from scraps cut from criticisms of this description which have come under my eye. The book, or some part of it, has been denounced as a "Munchausen story"; as "revealing a spirit of bigotry and intolerance befitting a Spanish inquisitor"; as "quibbling of the pettiest kind"; as "petty and ridiculous"; as made up "by garbled quotations and the suppression of facts"; and as "a gross misrepresentation"; while one

critic in especial has repeatedly insisted that it makes "a dishonest use of the sources of history." The author has in this connection been personally stigmatized, directly or indirectly, as a "self-complacent," "reckless," "pretentious," "illiberal," "ill-tempered," "abusive," "outrageous," "untrustworthy," "quibbling," "dishonest," "discreditable," "morally incapable," and "exceedingly weak" "trafucator"; "not in a fit moral state," who can put forth no claim "as an honorable man, to say nothing of him as a Christian minister." One weekly Baptist newspaper, called *Zion's Advocate*, of Portland, Me., has returned to the matter at twelve different times which have come to my knowledge, and has published more than eight columns upon the subject, having, on at least five separate occasions, made it the topic of its leading editorial. Not satisfied with this, or with inspiring utterance in, if not writing through, other Baptist journals, the editor of this *Advocate*, Rev. H. S. Burrage, has once attacked the 'Monograph' over his initials in the *Tribune*, insisting there that I had misstated the facts on one subject, and adding the insinuating comment: "A writer who misstates the facts at one point will not hesitate to do the same at other points." Still further, once over his initials, and once over his full signature, he has made appeal to the public of the *Nation* against me, in the first letter accusing me of "misrepresentation" and a "garbled statement"; in the second charging me with "doubly" misleading my readers while attempting to show that I have made "three" endeavors to explain my "error," which he would have it appear are all different and all unsuccessful.

Under these circumstances I respectfully ask space for the briefest possible reply, to the end that I may not appear to your wide constituency, by silence, to confess the justice of these accusations.

And, in the first place, I ask to have it borne in mind that my whole tractate is of the most condensed description; that only eleven pages are devoted to all the "further words" which it utters "concerning the Baptists"; and that there is not a line of its text in which I have breathed any surmise or hinted any judgment upon the topic concerning which I am especially arraigned—to wit, the quality of the whipping of Obadiah Holmes by the authorities of Massachusetts. The columns of insinuation and vituperation to which I have referred have been called forth almost solely by a note [No. 478] of eight lines on page 121, in which—it is curiously remarkable—I had no intent of expressing any opinion whatsoever of my own upon the matter.

Having stated in the text that Holmes had received thirty stripes, it occurred to me to add the most condensed reference to different judgments which eminent historians had expressed concerning that transaction. I accordingly cited my old classmate and life-long friend Arnold's opinion that it was cruel, and on the other side Dr. Palfrey's suggestion that the whipping might have been mitigated. And that my readers might know on what this hope was founded I introduced the two passages from *III. News* to which he refers. To make the matter exact and clear I will put Dr. Palfrey's words and my own side by side:

DR. PALFREY [*Hist. N. Eng.*, ii. 353].

When he [Holmes] relates that the scourging which he endured "was so onerous to him that he could well bear it; yea, and in a manner felt it not," and that he "told the magistrates, 'You have struck me as with roses,'" the reader ventures to hope that the executioner had been directed by his superiors to vindicate what they thought the majesty of the law at little cost to the delinquent.

* *III. News*, 22.

MONOGRAPH [Note 478, p. 121].

Arnold thinks he was "cruelly whipped" [*Hist. B. L.*, i. 235]. But Clarke says "it was so easy to me that I could well bear it, yea, and in a manner felt it not"; and that he told the magistrates after it was over, "You have struck me as with roses" [*III. News*, etc., 22]. Dr. Palfrey suspects the executioner had orders "to vindicate what they thought the majesty of the law at little cost to the delinquent" [*Hist. N. Eng.*, ii. 353].

Here, of course—as always, since I discovered the blunder after it was too late to correct it in the plates—I admit having erred by forgetting for the moment that, although it was Clarke's book from which the words were taken, they were still from Holmes's letter in that book; so that I was really making Clarke, instead of Holmes, the recipient of the whipping. I cited Dr. Palfrey's references before I quoted him, because, at the moment of writing, it seemed to me that I could intelligibly condense the whole into less space in that than in any other way. In regard to the main question here at issue, whether Arnold or Palfrey were the nearer right in the view taken, I did not suppose myself to be expressing any judgment whatever—surely did not intend to express any. This, partly because, in some respects and as to some points, there is conflict of testimony; but mainly for the reason that the density of the plan I was pursuing in the composition of the volume ruled out what seemed to be a side issue.

With regard to the whole matter, then, I have simply to say that I was in error—which I have ever freely acknowledged—as to the name aforesaid; and I have no doubt I must have been excessively clumsy in

the construction of a note which has given color in many minds to the thought that I was expressing an independent judgment, when the extent of my purpose was to bring under my reader's eye, in the most compact form, the opposing views already expressed by wiser men than myself. It does not appear to me that I misrepresented history, or that I garbled facts. I certainly did not do so with malice aforethought.

And whether, under all the circumstances, a fair and honorable criticism would pursue such a note year after year, and through column after column, insisting to put upon it a sense utterly and always repudiated by its author, is a question which—not intending to revert to the subject—I cheerfully submit to all candid, not to say to all Christian, men.

HENRY M. DEXTER.

GREYSTONES, NEW BEDFORD, JUNE 5, 1880.

THE INTRANSITIVE VERB "CLAIM."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION :

SIR: While thanking you for your notice, at p. 349, of 'Doctor Indoctus,' I hope you can allow me space for a short comment on one of your criticisms there. Quoting from me the words "since he *claims to sit* in judgment on the expression," you remark that the locution italicized, "though often condemned, could long ago appeal to respectable usage on both sides of the water." What you first speak of as a fact, namely, that the locution has been condemned, is a brand-new contribution to my knowledge of the details of ignorance. As to my having authority for it, that I most certainly have. And the authority is of the highest.

Neither Dr. Johnson nor his last editor, Dr. Latham, recognizes *claim* as an intransitive verb. Dr. Johnson, under the transitive verb *claim*, gives, however, a passage from Locke, in which the verb is plainly intransitive, but used absolutely. That passage is adduced by Dr. Worcester, under the heading of "*claim*, v. n.," and Dr. Webster's latest editors have profited by his example.

Of *claim*, as I have used it, there is so early warrant as that of Robert Mannyng, of the fourteenth century, in a passage cited by Dr. Richardson. I have by me, also, four passages, equally in point with that of Mannyng, from Lydgate; one, a little later, from Sir John Fortescue; three from Lord Berners, of Henry the Eighth's time; and others from 'Ferrex and Porrex,' Shakspeare, Lord Herbert of Cherbury, etc., etc. Nor has the use in question ever been in abeyance since it arose. Paley, in the last century, exemplifies it in the preface to his 'Philosophy.' In our own century it has had the sanction of William Taylor, Henry Hallam, Sir Henry Holland, Dr. Whewell, Bishop Thirlwall, Cardinal Newman, Cardinal Manning, George Eliot, Professor Newman, Bishop Elliott, Sir H. S. Maine, Sir J. F. Stephen, Mr. Leslie Stephen, Mr. John Morley, Mr. Matthew Arnold, Mr. Herbert Spencer, the Rev. Mark Pattison, Mr. William Minto, and Mr. E. A. Freeman. It is simply to avoid tediousness that I cut short this list of references.

From Lord Macaulay I might bring forward four passages to my purpose; two of them being in his 'Essays,' and the other two in his 'History.' We read, in the latter work, ch. xvii.: "At length, in 1805, the last bishop of that society which had proudly *claimed to be* the only true Church of England dropped, unnoticed, into the grave."

In Dr. Webster's Dictionary, ed. 1848, we find, under "*claim*, v. t." (*sic*): "2. To assert or maintain as a right; as, he *claims to be* the best poet of the age." This, as if considered to authorize bad English, has since been struck out by Dr. Webster's editors.

I should define the *claim* under consideration by "profess, as of right," and, sometimes, by "assert a right." The profession denoted, and so the assertion, may be either expressed or implied.

The use of *claim* which seems, on several grounds, objectionable, is that which drops from it the idea of right, title, or due, and retains only the idea of predication or contention; as in the subjoined sentence, from Prof. A. S. Hill's 'Principles of Rhetoric,' p. 163: "Herbert Spencer *claims* that such a principle is to be found in what he calls 'economy of attention.'" Prof. Hill forgets that, at p. 8, he distinctly ostracizes the solecism which he himself lapses into.

But many reputable American stylists do as ill. Mr. J. R. Lowell, for instance, has: "We may *claim* that England's history is also ours" ('My Study Windows,' p. 64). And Dr. O. W. Holmes writes: "The end of all religious discussion has come when one of the parties *claims* that it is thinking or acting under immediate divine guidance" ('Memoir of J. L. Motley,' pp. 206, 207).

That, for some time, Englishmen, here and there, have been giving into

this corruption,—together with its variation, *it is claimed that*, etc.,—has not escaped me. The proofs are at my elbow.

The intransitive *claim*, in the sense of "maintain," and followed, like *maintain*, by *that*, is not, however, altogether modern. In a work published in 1648, entitled 'Relations and Observations,' etc., by the cryptononymous Theodorus Verax, there occurs, at p. 41 of Part I.: "About one thousand apprentices, wholly unarmed, came down . . . with another petition, . . . therein *claiming that* to order the city militia was the cities birthright," etc.

Only in America, as yet, a vagabond "*claims to be* a tramp," meaning merely that he "declares himself to be" one.

Your obedient servant,

F. H.

P.S.—'Doctor Indoctus,' though a few copies of it have left my hands, is not yet published, and its present imprint will be removed from its title-page.

MR. STOUGHTON'S ARTICLE ON RUSSIA.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION :

SIR: Would it not have been proper for Mr. E. W. Stoughton, in his article on "Popular Fallacies about Russia" in the June number of the *North American Review*, to have acknowledged himself more deeply indebted to Mr. Cobden than would appear from the fact that he quotes him professedly in only two places? The portion of the article to which I refer extends from the words "At the death, in 1572," on page 543 of the *Review*, to the words "property of the Polish peasants," on page 545, a space covering over two pages. In this portion of his article Mr. Stoughton, although stating that his information is taken "from reliable sources," nevertheless gives the reader the impression that he has himself examined the authorities which he quotes, and that all which is not in quotation marks is his own work.

And yet I think I can show, in the first place, that Mr. Stoughton has taken his quotations from Cobden's essay on "Russia" without original examination on his part; and, in the second place, that what would appear by the absence of any quotation marks to be Mr. Stoughton's original work, is nevertheless taken almost verbatim from the same authority.

With regard to the first matter, I will premise that there is not a single quotation made by Mr. Stoughton in that part of his article which Mr. Cobden has not also made in his pamphlet, excepting, of course, where Mr. Stoughton professes to quote Cobden himself.

Moreover, on page 545, where Mr. Stoughton quotes from the "Cabinet Cyclopædia-History of Poland," a comparison of his extract with the original discloses the fact that, in two places, the quotation is not a correct transcript thereof, while it is in precisely those two places that Mr. Cobden's quotation from the same authority also differs therefrom. In Mr. Stoughton's article, and in Mr. Cobden's pamphlet, the words "*coal*" and "*insurrection of 1830*" occur, while the corresponding words in the original are "*expense*" and "*present insurrection*."

Again, on page 544, Mr. Stoughton says:

"The wise reform [*sic*], says an able historian, Herren [*sic*], 'that gave to Russia, at the hands of Peter the Great, the seeds of a power which has since grown to such greatness, and which, if adopted by Poland, would have, in all probability, conducted her to a similar state of prosperity, were absolutely rejected by the profligate nobles, because they must necessarily have involved some amelioration of the fate of the people.'"

I have looked carefully through Heeren's 'Manual of the Political System of Europe and its Colonies' for this quotation, and have failed to find it, while, on the other hand, I find in Cobden's pamphlet (page 96) the following:

"Those wise reforms that gave to Russia, from the hands of Peter the Great, the seeds of a power which has since grown to such greatness, and which, if adopted by Poland, would have, in all probability, conducted her to a similar state of prosperity, were absolutely rejected by the profligate nobles because they must necessarily have involved some amelioration of the fate of the people."

Mr. Cobden refers in a foot-note to Heeren's Manual as his authority for the above paragraph, which is, however, original with him; and I think it will be apparent to every one that Mr. Stoughton, in making use of Mr. Cobden's pamphlet, has been led by this reference into imagining that the above sentence was a quotation from Heeren, and that he has inserted it in his article as such without further examination.

With regard to the second matter—viz., that what purport to be Mr. Stoughton's original remarks are nevertheless to be found in Mr. Cobden's essay—the following table will furnish the best evidence that can be

offered. The edition of Cobden which I have used is "The Political Writings of Richard Cobden." London: Wm. Ridgway. 1878."

Stoughton.

1. "At the death, in 1572, of Sigismund Augustus, the last of the race of hereditary Polish kings, the nobles—between one hundred and fifty and two hundred thousand in number—formed a constitution, exclusively for their own benefit, which did not even notice the existence of the great mass of the miserable people who were slaves, in which it was provided that the nobles should pay no taxes, should have power of life and death over their vassals, should hold all offices—civil, military, and ecclesiastical—and in choosing their king should lay him under any restrictions they pleased." "Popular Fallacies about Russia," *North American Review*, June, 1880, p. 543.

2. "They met ready to sell themselves to the highest bidder at the court of Austria, France, Saxony, Sweden, or Brandenburg" (*Id.* p. 543).

3. "One universal scene of corruption, faction, and confusion reigned" (*Id.* p. 544).

4. "Almost every election was the signal for a civil war, usually lasting during the greater portion of the next reign, so that for the entire period of two hundred years, from the first election to the partition, Poland was the constant scene of anarchy, and its attendant miseries—fire, bloodshed, and famine" (*Id.* p. 544).

5. "The historian who recounts the miseries showered upon the millions of slaves during this career of sacrilege and rapine—for religious fanaticism armed itself with torture and the sword—exclaims, 'Oh! that some strong despot would come and in mercy rescue these people from themselves!'" (*Id.* p. 544).

6. "And in the order issued to the troops to quell it they were required, under severe penalties, to respect the houses and property of the Polish peasants" (*Id.* p. 545).

Cobden.

1. "At the death, in 1572, of Sigismund Augustus—the last of the Jagello race, in whose house the throne of Poland had been hereditary—a new constitution was framed. . . . In this constitution—which was concocted for the exclusive benefit of the aristocracy, and did not even notice the existence of the great mass of the wretched people, the slaves—it was agreed, amongst other enactments, that the nobles should pay no taxes: that they should have the power of life and death over their vassals; that all offices, civil, military, and ecclesiastical, should belong to them; and that, in choosing whom they would for a king, they were privileged to lay him under what restrictions they pleased." "Polit. Writ. of Richard Cobden," article "Russia," chap. ii. p. 94.

2. "The members of the diet . . . were ready to sell themselves to the best bidder at the courts of Vienna, France, Saxony, Sweden, or Brandenburg" (*Id.* p. 94).

3. "Poland became one universal scene of corruption, faction, and confusion" (*Id.* p. 94).

4. "Almost every election became the signal for a civil war, which usually lasted during the greater portion of the next reign; and thus, for the whole period from 1572 down to 1772, when the first partition was perpetrated by the three neighboring powers, Poland was the constant scene of anarchy, and its attendant miseries—fire, bloodshed, and famine" (*Id.* p. 95).

5. "The historian who recounts the calamities that were showered upon the unhappy millions, the slaves, during this career of rapine and sacrilege, exclaims, 'Oh! that some strong despot would come, and in mercy rescue these people from themselves!'" (*Id.* p. 96).

6. "And, in the order issued to the Russian troops employed to quell the insurrection, they are required, under severe penalties, to respect the houses and property of the Polish peasants" (*Id.* p. 100).

I will only add that, after eliminating from that portion of the article which is now in question those parts for which Mr. Stoughton seems to have been indebted to Mr. Cobden, the amount of original work is reduced to a minimum of about 13 lines, scattered through the two pages, and serving merely as a thread on which to string the pearls which the author has gathered.—Truly yours,

B. MCE. W.

NEW YORK, May 31, 1880.

NEW ENGLAND TOWN MORALITY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Some years since our town government was carried by "The Friends of the People." The other party bore with it because they hoped the finances could not be touched, since the treasurer, who had filled the office for some years, and in whom all had the greatest confidence, would probably not be turned out. For some reason the books of the treasurer were examined, and a deficiency of over \$8,000 found. The town did not indict him, his bondsmen making up what had been stolen, for the general feeling of the town was: "We don't want to be too hard on the man, for after all he was not so very bad—only a little weak; he was under the control of his partner, who made him do it. But if we could only reach the partner without harming the treasurer we would show some of the indignation we feel."

Not having the town's money any longer to fall back upon, the firm immediately went into bankruptcy. The partner soon found a situation, and now as then is a power in the town, flourishing as formerly on all public occasions, and making after-dinner speeches, etc., while the thief, after being in different occupations, is now in the employ of the United States, assisting in taking the census.

What hope can we have for the future while honest (?) Eastern towns permit and sanction such public morality? *

JUNE 1, 1880.

Notes.

D. APPLETON & CO. publish immediately the English translation of Kossuth's "Memories of My Exile" and "An Outline of the Public Life and Services of Thomas F. Bayard."—R. Worthington announces

"Curiosities of Puritan Nomenclature," by Charles W. Bardsley, and "Science of Voice Production and Voice Preservation"—J. W. Bouton will receive subscriptions for "The Parliamentary Album and Political Atlas of Great Britain and Ireland for the General Election of 1880." This work offers in return for the hundred dollars asked for it the portrait of every candidate, with a biography and his election address, statistics in relation to his constituency, an analysis of the rival opinions of the press during the elections, and plans of the old and new Houses of Commons before and after the elections, with seats designated. The editor fairly insists on the more than ephemeral value of this memorandum.—S. W. Tilton & Co., Boston, issue several series of what are called Design Cards, of which the first six are for studies in decoration and the seventh (specimens of which we have just received) for studies in general water-color painting. The cards are about six inches by three and a half, and in two sets, one done in faint outline only and the other colored with deftness and precision by Miss Hale, the artist. To the many people of leisure who have recently added painting in water-color to the category of their fancy-work the advantages of these cards will be obvious. The use of them differs from the juvenile practice of coloring wood-cuts in being at once more difficult, since the colors are washed in and not laid on; and less free, since there is a copy to be followed and directions how to do so. It is clearly desirable that the details in the originals should be as distinct as possible, and those before us have been so successful in this respect that their enforced lack of general effect need mislead no beginner with them into supposing the art of painting in water-color learned when they have been copied with never so great fidelity. This latter also, we can assure them, will be found a far less easy task than it may superficially appear.—Copies of sketches by Queen Victoria and the Prince Consort will by permission accompany an essay on "Queen Victoria and Art" in a forthcoming number of the *Magazine of Art* (Cassell, Petter & Galpin).—Loring, Short & Harmon, Portland, have issued a fifth edition of Mrs. Clara Barnes Martin's "Mount Desert, on the Coast of Maine." The text has been slightly enlarged, and the work remains, with its pretty photographic vignettes and tasteful typography, the most elegant of our summer guide-books.—Geo. A. Bates, Salem, Mass., has in preparation "Marine Animals of Our Coasts and Bays," by Jas. H. Emerton, and "Illustrations of the Handiwork in Stone, Bone, and Clay of the Native Races of the Northern Atlantic Seaboard of America," by Dr. C. C. Abbott.—We are glad to learn that Mr. Ismar S. Ellison's recent address on the Germans of Buffalo, N. Y., which we noticed last week, will be issued in pamphlet form by the Historical Society, and that a German edition is also in preparation.—The National Conference of Charities and Correction will be held at Cleveland, Ohio, on June 29 and the three following days.—The Concord (Mass.) Summer School of Philosophy will open for a second term on Monday, July 12, and will continue for five weeks. All students should be registered at the office of the Secretary, Mr. F. B. Sanborn, on or before July 1.—Baltimore is to celebrate, under the lead of the Maryland Historical Society, its one hundred and fiftieth anniversary during the week ending October 9. The Society's programme of exercises includes a civic procession, an assembly of delegates from the various local charities, a musical festival, an historical oration and poem, and a dinner. In the midst of the electoral heat of the coming fall such a celebration will serve a doubly useful purpose. With the aid of the Historical Society and the Johns Hopkins University it cannot fail of success.—The latest among the rapidly growing addenda to the "Bibliographie Moliéresque" is M. F. Bouquet's "La Troupe de Molière et les deux Corneille à Rouen," which, while it contains nothing very new or important, sets straighter than before the story of Molière's sojourn in Normandy.—For the first time, in its May number, *Polybiblion* undertakes a summary review of theatrical literature—"Théâtre Contemporain." The reviewer signs himself only with initials "V V."—In the admirable "Nouvelle Bibliothèque Classique" of M. Jouaust—admirable because the books in it are well edited, beautifully printed, and really cheap—a much-needed selection from Chamfort's writings has just been published. Chamfort's fame rests rather on his wit than on his literary works. For the first time the maxims are arranged in order; they fill the most of the first volume, as the anecdotes and witticisms hold the chief place in the second. They can be recommended to all lovers of La Rochefoucauld and Douglas Jerrold, for, odd as the juxtaposition may seem, it may serve to define Chamfort's quality. There are indexes to each volume. Some of the anecdotes and jests have the directness and freedom of the French Revolution, to the understanding of which they contribute greatly.—The second *livraison*, Bernard-Chabron, of Vapereau's "Dictionary of Con-

temporaries' (F. W. Christern) is noticeably less rich in new names than the preceding. By far the largest space (5½ pp.) is allotted to M. de Bismarck, whose career is related without abuse, but with unconcealed antipathy. The Duc de Broglie fills two pages. American names are few. Simon Cameron is admitted, but the hereditary genius shown in his son Don does not secure mention for the latter even in small capitals. Mr. Blaine is not yet a "contemporain." The death of H. C. Carey has been overlooked.—We learn from the *Portefeuille* that Oudemans's invaluable 'Middle and Old Netherlandish Dictionary,' on which the author has bestowed forty years' labor, will be finished next month by the issuing of Part VII., the most bulky of all. The publisher, H. W. Van Marle, of Arnhem, has been ten years in bringing it out.

—Colonel Higginson's 'Young Folks' History of the United States,' which was translated some years since into German, has now had the good fortune to be remarkably well translated into French under the title, 'Histoire des Etats-Unis racontée à la jeunesse,' by two Parisian professors of history, MM. Ovrée and Varembe. The book forms a part of Hetzel's new educational library; it is very neatly printed, and is singularly free from those misprints which disfigure almost every French book when dealing with English proper names. So far as we have examined the translation, it is exceedingly accurate, though ingenuity is sometimes required to give a French equivalent for current popular phrases and nicknames. "Mad Anthony" Wayne becomes "*Antoine l'Enragé*"; "Old Rough and Ready" Taylor is "*le vieux Risque-tout*"; the "Latter-Day Saints" become "*Saints des Seconds-Jours*"; and Monroe's "Era of Good Feeling" is "*L'ère du bon sentiment*." Some words are left untranslated, as being hopelessly English or American; for instance, *Meeting*, *Mob*, *Gentleman*, *Wigwam*, *Far-West*. The work is interesting as furnishing, so far as we can now recall, the first tolerably complete history of the United States in the French language; those of Laboulaye and others being only partial. It is evidently edited with great care, and is furnished with some notes on subjects especially interesting to Frenchmen, as Lafayette, Cornwallis, the early French colonization, and other matters. The well-known historian, M. Henri Martin, supplies a preface.

—One who follows the educational literature of the day in this country often has his attention arrested by the reports concerning the public schools of St. Louis. A little pamphlet just issued by Mr. Wm. M. Bryant, Principal of the Madison School of that city, and printed by Geo. I. Jones & Co., seems to us to merit a very wide circulation. The title is fairly indicative of the contents: "Catalogue of Apparatus belonging to the Madison School, and purchased from a fund arising from the annual picnics of the school." These picnics were begun in 1875, and, from the names of the citizens who have freely co-operated to make them successful, it is clear that the German fondness for outdoor enjoyment finds a natural vent in them. A small charge to the upwards of thirteen hundred children, and a slightly higher one to their parents and friends, have sufficed to meet all expenses and to leave a small surplus. This surplus, though quite incidental to the social and festive objects of the picnic, Mr. Bryant had the happy thought to apply in procuring permanent additions to the equipment of the school. He began with purchasing a fine magic-lantern, or sciopicon, with appropriate views, and as the years went on he was able to purchase valuable philosophical apparatus, and a number of books wisely designed to assist the teachers in preparing themselves for their classes, and capable of being read also by the pupils as a special privilege after lessons have been diligently learned. By a requirement of the Board of Education, weekly lectures on general history are now delivered in all the St. Louis schools, but at none, we dare say, under better auspices than at the Madison. We commend these evidences of an enlightened spirit to all educators.

—We have received Part I. of Carl Seelbach's 'Proverbial Treasury,' containing in its 190 pages "2,600 English and 2,300 selected foreign proverbs," translated from more than fifty different languages, ancient and modern (New York: Seelbach Bros., 89 White Street). The author's idea of a proverb is sufficiently liberal. What he gives us is sometimes a short fable; sometimes a definition, as this from W. R. Alger: "Aphorisms are portable wisdom, the quintessential extracts of thought and feeling"; sometimes a text for a discourse, like Franklin's "A Bible and a newspaper in every house, a good school in every district—all studied and appreciated as they merit—are the principal support of virtue, morality, and civil liberty"; sometimes a shibboleth, as, "Am I not a man and a brother?" Nor does a proverb in Mr. Seelbach's eyes require the seal of currency; he ventures, on p. 44, to make one himself—"A good wish is never too late." Any "gem of thought" that he meets in his reading

seems capable of turning out a proverb, so that after Shakspeare, and Locke, and Wordsworth, and Fuller, and Byron, and J. C. Hare, and Cowper, and George Herbert, it is not even startling to find Gov. Briggs among the coiners of proverbs, and the New York *Tribune* illuminating the same page with Arthur Helps, and William Penn, and Dr. Young, and Solomon, and Rochefoucauld—in this fashion: "A man of no known character would be believed sooner than a man of known bad character." The arrangement of the proverbs is alphabetic, but not according to the leading word. First we have all the *a's*, then the *all's*, the *an's*, the *as's*, the *af's*, etc.—a curious grouping, and one which makes it hopeless to try to estimate the completeness of the collection. The letter *a* just fills this first part. Typographically the book is sadly defective: there is no system in the abbreviations, nor in the indication of the source or authorship of the proverbs. Generally the nationality is printed in small capitals, but so is the name of H. W. Beecher after the very first "proverb," as if he formed a geographical as well as a theological category (cf. "saints, sinners, and the Beecher family"). Finally, the author's unfamiliarity with English has caused him to overlook the vulgarity of a few of his examples. Somewhat at random notes are added, often at considerable length, by way of illustration or explanation; and these relieve a little the monotony of the list. The collection, with all its drawbacks, must be pronounced meritorious. Probably no such number of foreign proverbs was ever translated into English for one work.

—In imitation of the successful *Paris-Murcie* the *Art Interchange* of this city has recently published, "for the benefit of famine-stricken Ireland," the *Art Autograph*, of which the contents are contributed by well-known public men, editors and artists, each after his kind. It is an interesting publication, and, aside from the wish that its sale may be large, which every charitable person will feel, it is of value both as a memento and intrinsically. Some of the reproduced drawings by American painters are excellent, and lend a really artistic interest to what might easily have degenerated into a cheap and perfunctory affair; among them we may specify, perhaps, Mr. Vedder's characteristic attempt to depict the abstract quality of supernatural weirdness, and the drawing of a mask of the late Mr. Lincoln taken in 1860, by Mr. Douglas Volk, which is an impressive thing. The autograph "sentiments" are from a range of eminent personages wide enough to include President Hayes and Mary Anderson, but nevertheless, both in its omissions and selections, apparently somewhat hap-hazard. The "sentiments," also, are of wide range; some of them being, superficially at least, open to the imputation—surely pardonable, however, in such circumstances—of irrelevance.

—Mr. Marshall, the well-known line-engraver, has on exhibition in Union Square his painting of "Jesus of Nazareth," which is a colossal head and shoulders without any accessories. Apart from its size, it is large and "important"; perhaps no one who sees it will fail to be impressed by its dignity and the genuineness of the painter's conception, and it is within the truth to say that it is entirely worth seeing. This, however, is not saying that it is entirely successful, and, indeed, it may be safely granted that to be entirely successful a "portrait" of Jesus of Nazareth painted in New York in 1880 would need to be a very remarkable work. The difficulties with which the painter has to contend are obviously great: on the one hand, the conventional face has held its own so long, and, we may add, so well, that some tribute to it the most original of new conceptions must pay; on the other, any variation from the settled type must be a matter of the greater difficulty from the fact that the imagination is thus fettered at the outset. In other words, an essentially new face runs the risk of not being recognized; and one only slightly varied, the risk of being esteemed trivial as a new conception. Mr. Marshall seems to have, no doubt unconsciously, compromised in these respects. Apparently he essays a certain amount of historical portraiture by making the hair, beard, and eyes black, and the whole countenance unmistakably Jewish; but as historically the question is only one of probabilities, in this departure he may be considered original rather than "realistic." Nevertheless the lower jaw and beard are of the conventional type, and any one who chooses can test the correctness of our judgment that the whole is not thoroughly satisfactory by shutting off these with his hand and seeing if it is not they after all which identify the countenance. Above the chin the face looks like that of a well-conditioned young Jew, and indeed it has, perhaps, too Hebraic a cast to suit the average Gentile ideal of the Saviour. For the rest, it is painted in the manner and with the feeling of an artistic engraver who has a delight in color as exhibited in the work of the best colorists, and who has therefore displayed wisdom in paying careful direct attention to tone, gradation, and

so on, instead of using his brush with the freedom with which familiarity alone can endure a painter's handling—or, indeed, his technique in the broadest sense.

—The new Metropolitan Concert-Hall, opened a fortnight since, promises to prove an important addition to the resources of the city in the way of amusement. The development of fashionable summer beer-gardens in New York has been attended with hosts of difficulties. At one time Theodore Thomas seemed to be firmly established at the Central Park, and the music which he gave there was as good as any which could be heard in the world. The place, however, was rather remote, and the so-called "garden" bore an unpleasant resemblance, even when decorated with colored lamps, to an ordinary back-yard. The enterprise, we believe, never proved very successful, and, at any rate, the Thomas concerts came to an abrupt end, and Mr. Thomas went to Cincinnati. They were succeeded by the conversion of the railroad depot in Twenty-seventh Street into a garden, which as a beer-garden was really very fine. But the music was generally poor, and except on rare occasions the vast enclosure had an empty look that was rather forlorn. It resembled too nearly one of those halls in Western cities in which national conventions are held, without a convention. It had, in fact, great capacities, which were never properly made use of. Since the recent accident to the building it has got a bad name and is threatened with demolition, but those who have watched its fortunes for the past few years will always retain pleasant memories of its Gilmorean music, its Titanic cascade, its vast array of tables and boxes and rustic chairs, its serpentine paths, its loud-voiced soloists, its agile cornet-players, its world-renowned artists of all kinds. This garden, however, was never more than a half-success. It was followed by another attempt in Twenty-third Street, which has proved completely successful. Messrs. Koster & Bial have a concert-hall and a garden; but their garden, as must almost necessarily be the case in the lower part of the city, is merely an enclosure surrounded with high walls, which make thorough ventilation out of the question. Besides this, for some reason, the Twenty-third Street Concert-Hall has never become fashionable as either Thomas's or the Madison Square Garden was fashionable. Profiting by all these experiments, the projectors of the Metropolitan Concert-Hall determined to construct their place of amusement on a new and original plan. The first difficulty about any place of the kind in New York is the weather. What people desire to do is to spend the evening out of doors. What they must be ensured against is exposure to the rain. To combine these two apparently opposite requirements was the object to be attained. It has been secured by utilizing the roof of the building as a promenade. Round three sides of the building extends a roof wide enough to afford room for tables and chairs and a walk besides. This affords a cool place for the evening, provided the weather is good, where the music can be heard almost as well as inside. Besides this, the main hall has a sliding roof which can be opened in a few seconds, and which affords perfect ventilation for the centre of the building. Inside, the arrangements are very much those of a large music-hall, with seats near the music, galleries, and private boxes. In addition to all this there is a restaurant, but no bar. This is of itself a distinct step in advance, as the bars connected with the beer-gardens hitherto established in New York have been the main objection to them. For music, the managers have secured the services of Mr. Aronson, whose orchestra is very good, and who leads fairly well. It is hardly to be expected that we should ever have such music again as Thomas used to give, and the popular selections of Mr. Aronson are quite enough for warm summer evenings. The new concert-hall has opened in a very promising way, and its substitution of the roof for the back-yard as a place of evening recreation may be said to make a new and auspicious departure in concert-hall architecture in New York.

—Mr. Wilkie Collins, in the current *International Review*, follows up Mr. Matthew Arnold's recent *Fortnightly* article in behalf of an international copyright law in quite a different temper; whereas Mr. Arnold affected to hope something from the ultimate development in us of "the spirit of delicacy" and scouted the notion of any natural right in the premises, Mr. Collins bases his "Considerations" on the ground of common justice, and, by implication at all events, seems to care very little about "the spirit of delicacy." The editors of the *Review*, indeed, accompany his article with a note explaining in effect that they believe in international copyright, but are not responsible for Mr. Collins's intemperate tone. Nevertheless, the latter protests that he is "cool," and contrives to be moderately entertaining as usual, if not to be unusually instructive. His main notion, however, the axiom with which he sets out, we may say

—namely, that American publishers are highwaymen—is hardly to be accepted in this country, since there are several of them of whom the contrary is notorious; and one may venture the wish that he had really attempted to do what, under some curious hallucination, he fancies he has done—"clear away the extraordinary accumulation of delusions under which the unfortunate subject of copyright has been smothered in recent years." Any one treating this "unfortunate subject" at this date ought to recognize two circumstances: first, that enough has been written about it to raise a presumption against a new writer's having anything new to say upon it; and, second, that it is by no means ethically or practically what is called "a plain case," to be disposed of "out of hand." If Mr. Collins had had any general idea to enforce, such as Mr. Arnold's view about cheap books and education, or any distinct remedy to propose, his paper might have been equally objectionable on grounds of taste, but would have avoided the almost humorous aspect of inutility and purposelessness which it actually has.

—There are, of course, various kinds and dignities of what the French call "causerie," but they may be roughly divided into the personal and the impersonal sort, of which the latter includes social and literary essays, both current and standard, that discuss the results of observation and reflection, whereas the former expresses for the most part the emotions which different phenomena excite in the mind of the writer. To personal "causerie," for example, belong the essays of Elia, the letters of Mérimée, the "Roundabout Papers" of Thackeray; to it also belong some recent contributions by Mr. James Payn to the *Nineteenth Century*, which are worth notice for that reason chiefly. For, though Mr. Payn has long been a prolific and more or less entertaining novelist, and the *Nineteenth Century* has for some time been in evident need of a sprinkling of light literature, it is difficult to see why Mr. Payn should have been appointed "causer" in ordinary, as it were, to so august a periodical. The difficulty is increased when, instead of the social article which we do not know that he could not do to perfection, we find him writing the "roundabout paper" for which he has no apparent aptitude. To make one's own emotions, little conversations with young ladies, little jokes and fond conceits, and favorite little turns of literary expression, acceptable to the public, one must be either a public man or a genius. Even with both these qualifications failure is not infrequent—the personal "causerie" of Dickens, for instance, finally reached a point at which it began to pall upon his public. And Mr. Payn has made the mistake of not perceiving this, and of chatting to the readers of the *Nineteenth Century* in a personal way which is calculated, we should think, gradually to change the austere character of its clientèle and bring it into fellowship with that of the *Atlantic Monthly's* "Contributors' Club."

—Mr. Payn's method of procedure is a common one, and typical enough to be described or, rather, illustrated. He secures, in the first place, a mild paradox as a theme, and then treats this in a half defiant, half deprecatory way, with the constant intimation that—though, considering their obvious soundness, it is singular they are not universal—these are his opinions and nobody else's, and he is prepared to be set down as a fool if the reader pleases, which he knows very well the reader will consider absurd. In a recent article on "Sham Admiration in Literature," for example, he maintained the thesis, already sufficiently popular it might be thought, that one should stick to one's own opinion in defiance of the consensus of competent criticism. In a paper on "The Pinch of Poverty," in the last *Nineteenth Century*, he admits at the outset (in two pages) that absolute want is worse than straitened means, but he thinks the "pinch" as well as the "grip" of poverty unpleasant, and proceeds to discuss it in this wise: "I don't believe in bachelors ever experiencing the pinch of poverty"; he has heard them complain of it at the club while ordering extravagantly, "but, after all, what does it signify even if they were reduced to cockles?" The case is different with the girls of large families with moderate incomes; "I have known some very charming ones" who, when occasionally guests in certain mansions, "trembled when the officious lady's-maid has meddled with their scanty wardrobe." Indeed, "in the investigation of this interesting subject, I have had a good deal of conversation with young ladies" who have been very obliging in point of full information, besides giving it "in a manner so charming that, if it were common in witnesses generally, it would make blue-books the most delightful description of reading." One of these considered it a "pinch" to be obliged to wear black mittens when other girls wore long, white kid gloves, and Mr. Payn says, "I must confess I have a prejudice myself against mittens; they are, so to speak, 'gritty' to touch; so that the pinch, if it be one, experienced by the wearer is shared by her ungloved

friends." The essay concludes with: "A dinner of herbs where love is, is doubtless quite sufficient for us; only there must be enough of it, and the herbs should be nicely cooked in an omelette." All of which indicates the popularity among Mr. Payn's fellow-countrymen of playfulness as such.

—Louis Joliet, to whom, along with Marquette, the credit of discovering the Mississippi, after De Soto, is usually, and in all likelihood justly, ascribed, made two maps to illustrate his journeyings, neither of which has hitherto been printed. A third, which seems of earlier date than the others, has lately been published by M. Gabriel Gravier, President of the Norman Geographical Society, and author of various works touching early American exploration. This newly-found map is a careless piece of work, in which parts of the country which were perfectly well known to Joliet and many of his contemporaries are set down with an inaccuracy which can only have proceeded from haste. It settles no disputed question, and is chiefly interesting for the indications it gives of the change in its author's political attachments. In it he pays his court to Count Frontenac by naming the valley of the Mississippi *Frontenacrie*, and calling the Mississippi itself *Rivière Buade*, that being the Count's family name. Afterwards, when a coldness grew up between him and his former patron, he styled the river *Rivière Colbert*, and the adjacent country *Colbertie*. M. Gravier gives a careful analysis of the newly-found map, and a close comparison of it with other contemporary maps. Its value consists chiefly in its being the only specimen of Joliet's cartography that has ever been given to the public.

LIPPINCOTT'S GAZETTEER.*

THE first edition of this Gazetteer appeared in 1855; the second was issued in 1866, and the preface claimed for it that "every portion of the work" had been "subjected to a careful revision"; the edition before us is stated on the title-page to be "new," "thoroughly revised, re-written, and greatly enlarged." A glance of comparison suffices to justify a part of the new claim. The Gazetteer of 1880 is different from its predecessor in extent, print, paper, and binding, and all the difference is greatly in its favor. A closer examination also reveals the fact that the new edition has been subjected to a revision careful to a degree, and has been partly re-written, of neither of which advantages the second issue was ever entitled to boast, as we might show abundantly from the statistical portions. In other more important respects, moreover, the faultiness of the revision of 1866 renders the comparative merits of the latest edition the more conspicuous. The extent of the former neglect is strikingly illustrated by the following: In 1855 Moldavia was "a state of South Europe, . . . under the suzerainty of Turkey and the protection of Russia." And so was Wallachia. Each was "governed by an elected prince named the Hospodar." Moldavia was situated between "lon. 25° 18' " and "28° 18' E." Its area was "estimated at 18,000 square miles." By the peace of Paris, of 1856, the Russian protectorate was abolished, and a portion of Bessarabia was detached from Russia and annexed to Moldavia, extending the latter to lon. 30° 15' E., and increasing its area by several thousand square miles. In 1861 the permanent union of Moldavia and Wallachia, under the name of Rumania, and under the rule of one prince, was definitively proclaimed. Of all these changes since 1855 the "careful revision" of 1866 knew nothing; in that year's edition of the Gazetteer Moldavia and Wallachia remained separate principalities, under Russian protectorate and two hospodars, with area and extent exactly as in 1855; no such title as Rumania (or Roumania or Roomania) is to be found in either the main book or the supplement. The edition of 1880 has obliterated this crying defect by inserting an article "Roumania," historically supplementing the articles "Moldavia" and "Wallachia"—unfortunately, however, in so defective a manner that neither the act of union nor the reign of Couza is mentioned.

The reference to the events of 1877-78 as affecting the status and territorial conditions of Roumania is correctly worded. So is also the reference to the changed condition of Bulgaria. Serbia's declaration of independence in 1877 is also mentioned. But everything else belonging to Servian history is despatched in four lines. Two lines cover all the history of Bosnia, down to 1879, and eleven words that of Herzegovina, down to 1878. The notice of the last-named country is one of those—and we can-

not suppress the remark that such are exceedingly numerous—which are neither "thoroughly revised," nor "re-written," nor "enlarged." Not even this much are we told, that the Herzegovinians are Slavs. Montenegro has been more carefully looked after. Its northernmost geographical latitude, however, is marked without due regard to the change of boundaries wrought by the Treaty of Berlin. The same is the case with the southernmost latitude of Bulgaria, which is left as it was in the earlier editions, though the annexed territory south of Ghiustendil (or Kosten-dil) extends that country southward beyond "lat. 42° 8'." Ghiustendil, however, has been correctly changed from a town of "Room-Elee" into "a town of Bulgaria." The city of Batum and the Armenian towns of Ardahan, Artvin, and Olti have also duly been entered as possessions of Russia, which they became by the treaties of 1878. That Alaja-Hissar is still designated "a town of European Turkey, in Servia," is a slip probably owing to the insignificance of the notice. What is less pardonable is that the Servian name of that town is, under the Turkish head, called *Kruschovatz*, and in the respective references *Kruevatz* and *Krushovatz*, while the only correct form is *Krushevatz*. Eastern Rumelia is strangely called "a tributary province of Europe."

Little notice has been taken of the military events of 1877-78. Plevna has been inserted, with the brief remark: "It has been besieged and taken from the Turks by the Russians in 1877," and Shipka Pass as "a famous pass near the centre of the Balkan Mountains"; but Poradim and Gorni Studen, renowned as imperial headquarters during the struggle round Plevna; Dubnik, the capture of which decided the fate of that stronghold; Elena, Kamarii, Zevin, and many other names made memorable by the same war, are entirely ignored. There is no reference to the siege of Erzerum, and Kars is wrongly stated to have been taken in 1878. In regard to the Franco-German war of 1870-71, we notice the omission of Spichern, Vionville, and Rezonville, while Wörth, originally and now a German town, is strangely entered as "Woerth-sur-Sauer," and "Le Mans" is given without a reference to the great battle of January 11 and 12, 1871. Under "Königgrätz" there is no reference to the battle of Sadowna, which the Germans so often designate by the former name, and "Sadowna," which mentions "the great Prussian victory of July 3, 1866," does not tell us over whom the Prussians triumphed. "Kulm" and "Sedan" speak of defeats, but mention no surrender; "Vilagos" has no historical reference, and Kápolna is forgotten. Leuthen is amply noticed as a village "where, December 5, 1757, Frederick the Great defeated the Austrians," and Daun's victory over that monarch at Kolin is as fully stated; but Kunersdorf, where Frederick suffered a terrible rout, and his great triumph at Rossbach are ignored.

Much more attention has been bestowed upon events of the American Civil War, which, incredible as it may appear, the Gazetteer of 1866, with its "Appendix," most completely forgot. The references to that war, in the work before us, are comparatively numerous, but not numerous enough, and unequal as to correctness and fulness. Under "Pea Ridge" we find this detailed and accurate statement: "It was the scene of a battle in March, 1862, between the Union forces under General Samuel R. Curtis and the Confederates under General Van Dorn. The former remained master of the field." "Stonewall" Jackson's capture of Harper's Ferry is still more minutely told. The statements under "Chancellorsville," "Charleston," "Chickamauga," and "Nashville" are equally, or almost equally, full and accurate. Under "Bull Run," on the other hand, the commanders in the two battles are unnamed. Under "Gettysburg" there is no allusion to the fighting on July 1. Under "Fredericksburg" neither the day of the battle nor the commander of the Confederates is mentioned. Concerning the engagements at Winchester there is only a vague phrase without a date. Who was victorious at Cedar Creek we are not told. Under "Pittsburg Landing" we read that "a great battle was fought here between General Grant and General A. S. Johnston, April 6 and 7, 1862"—a statement doubly wrong as to the second day, as Johnston fell on the 6th, and Buell commanded instead of Grant on the 7th. Under "Fair Oaks" we are told that "in the vicinity was fought a bloody battle on May 31, 1862"; that the battle is also known as the Battle of Seven Pines; that it was continued on June 1. But who commanded and who kept the field, is not stated; nor is the name Seven Pines to be discovered elsewhere. To make this worse, the notice "Chickahominy River" speaks of the same engagement as fought in June, ignoring the first day. Under "Stone River" even the mention of the year in which the protracted combat on the banks of that river took place is wanting. The battle of Pleasant Hill, fought April 9, 1864, is placed in April, 1863. No allusion is made to the siege and capture of Wilmington; nor is there any to the battle of Springfield, or Wilson's Creek.

* "Lippincott's Gazetteer of the World. A complete Pronouncing Gazetteer or Geographical Dictionary of the World. Containing notices of over one hundred and twenty-five thousand places. With recent authentic information respecting the countries, islands, rivers, mountains, cities, towns, etc. In every portion of the globe. New edition, thoroughly revised, re-written, and greatly enlarged. By a number of able collaborators." Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1880. Royal 8vo, pp. 2,478.

The freshness of the new edition in regard to more properly geographical matters concerning the United States is apparent on almost every page, in spite of the fact that the statistical data of the census of 1870 had to be used in a great majority of cases. New descriptions of American States, towns, etc., have replaced the old ones, and the Gazetteer actually includes a "vast number of places which have either entirely sprung up since the issue of former editions or have of late, by their growing importance, become entitled to a notice." Nothing is, perhaps, more characteristic of the rapid dissemination of new settlements in this country, as well as of the attention with which the editors of the new Gazetteer availed themselves of the latest official communications on the subject, than the circumstance that four American Plevnas, all of course named after the Plevna of 1877, are recorded, besides two Osmans, named after its defender. The fulness and correctness of the new descriptive portions—whether referring to this or to other countries—must naturally vary according to the ability and fidelity of the "collaborators," a strict editorial control of the whole being almost impossible, and uniform rules as to the use of materials and selection of matter almost equally so. Strict uniformity would, in fact, be a detriment to the work, by rendering its readable portions unbearably monotonous. That single compilers will abuse the latitude necessarily granted them, some by copying without examination and others by sacrificing important points to topics more easily handled, is an almost unavoidable evil. It is only in tangible matters and on salient points that the editors can be made responsible for not "going behind the returns." They are, however, decidedly to be blamed for not demanding new research on many a topic which obviously called for it, or for not consistently introducing new results of enquiry. Thus, the altitudes of mountains (Catskills, Carpathians, etc.) are too often left in the new edition as they were stated in that of 1855, regardless of more recent and more authoritative measurements; and where alterations have been made, bewildering contradictions have not always been avoided—witness the following: Under "North Carolina" we read of "the Black Mountains, of which Mitchell's Black Dome, or Clingman's Peak, attains the height of 6,660 feet." "Clingman's Peak" gives the same height according to Guyot, and the height of 6,941 feet according to T. L. Clingman. Under "Black Mountains" we read that Clingman's Peak rises 6,941 feet, and "another peak, measured by Prof. Guyot and called by him the Black Dome, has an altitude of 6,707 feet. . . . This was formerly known as Mitchell's Peak." "Mitchell's Peak" gives only the latter figure, and also tells us that the peak so called "is sometimes called the Black Dome."

The greatest defects of the Gazetteer, however, are those for which the first edition is primarily responsible, and it sinned chiefly by trying to know too much—a weakness peculiar to most gazetteers in the English language. The remote reason of this lies in the poor orthography of the language, and in the multiplicity of transliterations and forms, correct and incorrect, which it gives rise to. Thus, to cite one of the worst examples, our Gazetteer, in all its editions, has this notice: "Lenczy, . . . [pronunciation]. Lenczye, . . . or Lenczyca, . . . written also Lentschek and Lenchek, a town of Poland . . ." and also references to "Lenczy" under "Lentschek" and "Lentschek," though not under "Lenchek." Now, we can positively assure our readers that of all the six forms given only one, Lenczyca (pron. Lentschitza), is correct in any European language whatever; all the others owe their existence to hasty copying and blundering attempts at transliteration. The beauty of the thing will best be appreciated by an American reader if he imagines to himself a foreign gazetteer with entries like the following: "Uti, Utie, or Utica, also written Uthtik or Uthik, a town of New York"; "Uthtik, a town of New York; see Uti"; "Uttik, a town of New York; see Uti." Keith Johnston's Gazetteer—"revised" edition of 1867—was so badly perplexed by this *embarras de richesse* concerning the names of that Polish town that it cut the community in twain, and, giving two notices, placed "Lenczy or Leczyca," with "3,370" inhabitants, in the government and "80 m. W.S.W." of Warsaw, and "Lenczyca or Lentschitza"—this is the second new name—with "5,955" inhabitants, in the government and "83 m. W.S.W. of Warsaw."

The superabundant knowledge of our Gazetteer is also displayed—in all the editions alike—in its foreign and ancient lore. To the heading "Sardinia," for instance, the following is attached: "It. *Sardegna*, . . . [pronunciation]; Fr. *Sardaigne*, . . . ; Ger. *Sardinien*, . . . ; Dutch, *Sardinie*, . . . ; Sp. *Sardegna*, . . . , or *Cerdeña*, . . . ; anc. *Sardinia* and *Ichnusa*; Gr. *Σαρδῶν, Sardo*, or *Σαρδάν, Sarden*, *Ἰχνοῦσα, Ichnousa*." This is at least all sound, if all superfluous; but the similar appendage to the heading "Jerusalem" is far from being equally correct. Instead of

finding how the city was called by the Jews, we learn that Jerusalem is "also *Kadushah* in Hebrew," which is to be reduced to this, that the Jews designated the city as *holy* (Heb. *Kedoshah*); and also that one of its Greek and Latin names was *Καδύτις, Cadytis*, which is certainly incorrect, though not entirely without foundation. No other Greek or Roman writer knows the name Cadytis but Herodotus, and it is only presumed, and presumed only by some, that by it he designates Jerusalem. A similarly useless piece of classical lore is appended to "Teliseof" (*sic* for Tel-Eskof), the name of an insignificant place near Mosul, which is located "in a large and fertile plain, celebrated for the passage of Xenophon over it and for the battle of Arbela, gained by Alexander the Great." A little more pruning of the original matter, with more enquiry as to the soundness of what must be preserved, would have made the new publication a much better work than it is; but even as now issued it is by far the greatest American gazetteer, and probably superior in many ways to the majority of English productions of a similar character and extent.

A NEW ENGLISH ANTHOLOGY.*

THESE volumes are earnest of the satisfactory execution of an almost ideal literary scheme, description of which is itself nearly a sufficient characterization. According to the preface, it is briefly "to supply an admitted want—that of an anthology which may adequately represent the vast and varied field of English poetry." It is certainly fair to argue that the lack of such an anthology implies the want of one, and we suppose most persons who have reflected about the matter at all have felt a desire for something better than and different from the many existing collections of English poetry, from Chalmers's complete one on the one side to such volumes as the admirable but professedly incomplete "Treasury" of Mr. Palgrave on the other. The marks of the present collection are its copiousness, which is as great as is consistent with critical selection; its comprehensiveness—it includes every name that is representative or that can be called prominent for any reason; and its fund of criticism. This last is, so far as we remember, unique in an English work of this kind. Each poet is assigned to some critic specially qualified to write about him, and we have thus, before the selections from each, a biographical paragraph and a brief critique by an expert, so to speak. The first two volumes begin with Chaucer and end with Dryden, and the "critical introductions" are distributed as follows: The editor, Mr. T. H. Ward—Chaucer, James L. Watson, Barnfield, "Elizabethan Miscellanies," Drummond, Alexander, Cowley; Prof. Skeat—Langland; T. Arnold—Gower, Lydgate, Oocleve; W. E. Henley—Henryson, Samuel Butler; Prof. Nicol—Dunbar, Lyndesay; A. Lang—Douglas, "Ballads," Constable, Chapman; the Dean of St. Paul's—Sackville, Spenser; A. C. Bradley—Marlowe, Beaumont, Fletcher; George Saintsbury—Warner, Daniel, Drayton; J. Churton Collins—Hawes, Skelton, Wyatt, Surrey, Hall, Lord Herbert; Mary A. Ward—Sidney, Brooke, Dyer, Davies; Prof. Dowden—Shakspeare; Prof. Hales—Gascoigne, Southwell, Raleigh, Donne, Giles Fletcher, Wotton; William Minto—Lyly, Peele, Marston, Dekker, Ford; Prof. A. W. Ward—Ben Jonson, Cartwright, Oldham, Dryden; W. T. Arnold—Browne, Wither, Habington; G. A. Simcox—Sandys, Herbert, Crashaw, Vaughan; Pattison—Milton; Goldwin Smith—Marvell; Edmund Gosse—Greene, Lodge, Carew, Herrick, Suckling, Lovelace, Waller, Randolph, Denham, Stanley, Davenant, the Earls of Roscommon, Dorset, and Rochester, Mrs. Aphra Behn, Sir Charles Sedley, and Otway.

Two volumes which contain these essays, besides abundant selections from the poets they characterize, have a value and importance that are obvious. They are, of course, not designed for the beginner in English literature, or their distinctively critical vein and the freedom of it could be objected to. Of the tact and discretion shown in making the different selections it is difficult to speak confidently; perhaps no two persons would perform this task alike, and no one could so perform it as to satisfy all readers; but it appears to us to have been executed here impersonally, and when that is secured and the different editors are experts, it may be said of criticism in detail of their labors that it is likely to have been anticipated and carefully considered by them. It is different with the various "critical introductions," and any one may suggest shortcomings or blemishes in these with a freedom tolerated by the clearness of the standard in each instance. The presumption, however, that if you employ men of known competence your work will be well done is confirmed

* The English Poets. Selections with Critical Introductions by various Writers, and a General Introduction by Matthew Arnold. Edited by Thomas Humphry Ward, M.A., late Fellow of Brasenose College, Oxford. Vols. I. and II. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1880.

by an examination of these essays in detail. They are admirably brief; each writer has apparently kept an eye on the purpose of his article, and we have in consequence very little surplusage; indeed, the error, if there be any in this respect, is on the side of meagreness in one or two instances. On the whole, to any one who reflects upon the prolixity and the subjective tendency of much contemporary English criticism contributed to the principal reviews, the excellent form of most of these introductions will prove a grateful surprise; they very pointedly illustrate the progress made in literary journeyman-work in England since 1865, say, when the author of the "General Introduction" here was effectively complaining of its quality. The superiority of the contributions of some of the younger men perhaps serves to explain this improvement, and is in itself an agreeable sign. As good as anything in the volumes is Mr. Andrew Lang's paper on "Ballads," and Mr. Gosse's on Herrick, say. Mr. Gosse, it will have been noticed, is a voluminous contributor, but we find nothing perfunctory in his most trivial paragraphs; both he and Mr. Lang write with directness, simplicity, and acumen, both view their uncommon special erudition as an equipment merely, and both have, as it were, the air of being understood by their audience exactly enough to preclude the necessity of saying anything trite and superficial; to the friends of English criticism, indeed, no indication could be more grateful than that of this confidence in an audience of cultivated perceptions as well as of seriousness. How different from the general run of contemporary criticism, for example, is this by Mr. Gosse on Waller, which almost suggests an entire essay (vol. ii. p. 273):

"English poetry is studded with the names of those who have possessed imagination and warmth of fancy, but who have failed to survive, in popular estimation, through their lack of style. Waller, on the other hand, is a signal example of the converse law, that a writer cannot subsist on style alone. The decay of reputation seems in the latter case to be less rapid, but it is in the end more fatal, for it is beyond the hope of reparation."

"Contrast this with Mr. Pattison's laborious ingenuity (vol. ii. p. 296) about descriptive poetry being a contradiction in terms, because a landscape "cannot be presented in words which, being necessarily successive, cannot render juxtaposition in space. To exhibit in space is the privilege of the arts of design." Hegel could not write about fine art more amiss. Or contrast such criticism as this of Mary A. Ward upon Sidney (vol. i. p. 344), "Other writers are sweeter, more sonorous; no other love-poet of the time is so real," with the perfunctory text-book ring of Mr. J. Churton Collins's chanting of Surrey's genius (vol. i. p. 255), "Its characteristic qualities are grace, vivacity, pathos, picturesqueness." Better still, when one considers the usual way in which the euphuists and "the false worship of diction" are spoken of, are such sentences as these of Mr. Gosse on Lodge (vol. i. p. 425):

"This languid, elegant literature was of great service in refining both the language and the manners of the people. There was something false, no doubt, in the excessive delicacy of the sentiment, something trivial in the balanced rhythm and polish of the style; but both were excessively pretty, and both made possible the pastoral and lyrical tenderness of the next half-century."

Fancy Professor Henry Morley countenancing anything that was "excessively pretty." Another instructive contrast is that of Mr. Lang's rapid, easy, appreciative, and even luminous essay on Chapman (vol. i. p. 510) with Mr. T. Arnold's on Gower (vol. i. p. 102), which has qualities not unlike those usually ascribed to Gower himself. It is difficult to see why the editor should have franked the trite surplusage beginning "The moralist declaims, the satirist paints: we are convinced of the deformity of vice in the one case, but we see it in the other," and so on. He has not a quick intolerance for what is trite, it may be, and in his own generally excellent essay on Chaucer we find a good deal that is too undeniably axiomatic to be inspiring. It is all, however, preferable to such elephantine tread as this of Professor Hales (vol. i. p. 558): "One may almost invert Jonson's famous panegyric on Shakspeare, and say that Donne was not for all time, but for an age." Professor A. W. Ward's essay on Dryden is, perhaps, a little magniloquent; Prof. Dowden's analysis of Shakspeare's sonnets possibly a little diffuse; and Mr. Pattison's "Milton," as we have intimated, somewhat over-elaborate and fanciful. But in the main we believe we have found all the fault that can fairly be found, and the quality of what we have neglected to mention is excellent. If the Rev. R. W. Church ascribes Spenser's moral allegorizing to the Elizabethan spirit, some bias of this sort may be forgiven the Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral; and if Mr. A. C. Bradley is a trifle loose in calling Shakspeare's narrative verse less "spontaneous and rich" musically than Marlowe's, it should be borne in mind that it is hard to get a hearing for

any of the Elizabethan dramatists except Shakspeare without some exaggeration and partisan ardor.

Against the errors of personal criticism and of an exaggerated historic estimate of poetry intrinsically trivial the "General Introduction" of Mr. Matthew Arnold is excellent protection. Here, again, examination bears out the wisdom of the editorial plan of securing the services of experts, and, as it would have been difficult to select any one from whom a better essay on English poetry could be predicted, few things that Mr. Arnold has written upon poetry can be considered more instructive and stimulating than this. It is a dispassionate and discriminating essay upon the nature of poetry, and an endeavor "to trace the stream of English poetry," without, of course, attempting definitions or scientific precision of any sort in the discussion of a subject whose essence is so evanescent. The argument is briefly this: Poetry has high destinies; without it science, philosophy, religion are felt to be incomplete. Our standard of it should be proportionately high; we should have constantly in mind, in reading poetry, "a sense for the best, the really excellent, and of the strength and joy to be drawn from it." This is the only real way of estimating poetry, indefinite as it may seem. Two other kinds of estimate threaten to supersede this—the historical estimate and the personal estimate. "A poet or poem may count to us historically, they may count to us on grounds personal to ourselves, and they may count to us really." To discover what is really excellent there can be no better help than "to have always in one's mind lines and expressions of the great masters and to apply them as a touchstone to other poetry." Other poetry need not be like them, but in this way we shall, "if we have any tact," discover if it has the same "high poetic quality." This method Mr. Arnold then follows out, beginning with Chaucer and ending with Burns. Fanciful as it may seem to *a priori* or sceptical philosophers concerning poetry, it has, used as he uses it, an evident value; it has, at least, the advantage of keeping one's mind fixed upon the real pith of the matter, unobscured by so-called "laws" and theories, scientific or other; and any one may apply it. To those, however, who may find it trivial, the results of its application by Mr. Arnold to Chaucer and Burns may be formally commended. The estimate of Burns is by far the closest and justest, to our mind, that has been made, and concerning this, as well as the estimates of Shelley, Gray, Dryden, and others, we advise the reader not to be beguiled by the fluidity of Mr. Arnold's prose into a somnolent inattention to their real importance.

THE ZULU WAR.*

THE fatal ignorance which may beset a nation in regard to the things which make for its peace, is very strikingly illustrated by the popular feeling in Great Britain respecting its Indian and Colonial possessions. No clear-sighted and unbiassed mind can fail to perceive that these dependencies vastly increase the vulnerability of Great Britain, while they bring her no advantages which she would not equally obtain from them if they were independent. This fact is more obvious in the case of the colonies than in that of India. The British colonies, or by far the larger portion of them, are self-governing communities, and the single duty which the mother-country is required to fulfil towards them is that of freely expending her blood and treasure in their defence. They, in fact, fritter away and exhaust her strength without making her any return whatever. For, as regards commerce, the present commercial relations between herself and her dependencies, seeing that these are based upon interest and necessity, would remain unaffected though every British colony became independent tomorrow. But if any writer or politician has the temerity to point out these obvious facts, a shout is immediately raised that he is a traitor in disguise who wishes to disintegrate the Empire. All right-minded people are entreated to shut their ears and not listen for a moment to what he has to say. In Kaffir wars, Zulu wars, Afghan wars, the credulous British public is hocus-pocussed into believing that it is somehow carrying on a noble and civilizing work, which more than compensates for the sacrifices it entails, and the burdens which, in consequence, have to be laid upon the poorer classes at home.

No part of the British colonial possessions has been the theatre of crueller and more devastating wars than South Africa; and these have been the more lamentable because the Kaffirs, against whom they have been carried on, are a race of superior intellectual capacity. Had they

* "History of the Zulu War and its Origin. By Frances E. Colenso. Assisted in those portions of the work which touch upon Military Matters by Lieutenant-Colonel E. Durnford." London: Chapman & Hall. 1880.

been treated with ordinary humanity and justice, they were capable of appropriating the advantages of civilization, and would have lived in peace and friendship with the white man. But the fact is that justice and humanity are qualities which flourish only under the restraints of a high civilization; and the men are few who, when they get beyond the reach of the police and the magistrate, find in the law written on their hearts an adequate substitute for those fleshly embodiments of justice. A notable example of this is to be found in the recent Zulu war. In Great Britain itself this war has been condemned with almost entire unanimity. Among the European residents at the Cape and in Natal it has been almost as universally applauded. These colonists cannot be brought to see that between them and the savage races which surround them the instincts of humanity and justice ought to be allowed any scope at all. Whatever they deem to be their own immediate personal interest, that they consider they have a right to take by fair means or by foul, as may be most convenient. Whenever the Englishman settles in a land peopled by what he considers an "inferior race" he regards the members of it as "interlopers." On a property which is rightfully his he feels towards these "interlopers" much as a Spanish inquisitor might have felt towards Jews and heretics; and hence the unsparing severity with which in India, as in the colonies, wars against these "inferior races" have been too often conducted. In the case, however, of the Zulu war, it would be unjust to lay the entire responsibility upon the colonists. The colonists greatly applauded a war whereby an "inferior race" had to be well-nigh exterminated at the cost of Great Britain. This was an achievement which harmonized in every way with their predilections. But they may be acquitted of having initiated the design. The secret history of that war is not yet fully divulged. Meanwhile Miss Colenso, in the book before us, has given a deeply interesting narrative of its origin and course down to the capture of the unhappy Ketchwayo, so far as these can be set forth without a knowledge of the Queen's and Lord Beaconsfield's private letters to Sir Bartle Frere.

A more pathetic story has never been told. The most marked characteristic in the Zulus and their king was their firm belief in the equity and good faith of the British nation. For fifteen years the encroachments of the Boers of the Transvaal upon their borders had been a cause of irritation and alarm to the Zulus. Left to themselves, the Zulus would have declared war against the Boers—a war which, beyond a doubt, would have resulted in the destruction of the little Dutch Republic. They had, however, not done so, in deference to the urgent entreaties of the English governors of Natal. Despite delays and disappointment, for fifteen years they continued to trust in their assurances that they would see right done between them and the Boers. It was after this long period of hope deferred that, in 1876, the Transvaal was annexed to the dominions of the Queen. This annexation—an act of disgraceful treachery—was deeply resented by the Boers; and the consequences which have since ensued show, for the millionth time, the futility of doing evil that good may come. The plea originally put forth in justification of the annexation of the Transvaal was the cruel treatment of the natives by the Dutch Boers. These had involved the Boers in a war with Sikukuni, a Kaffir chief, which the Republic appeared to be incapable of bringing to a conclusion. It was hardly doubtful that the conflagration would spread. The Zulus had complaints of long standing against the Boers, and would very probably make common cause with Sikukuni. These facts abundantly justified British interference in the affairs of the Transvaal; but they did not justify a sudden and violent appropriation of Dutch territory. In the secret instructions given by Lord Carnarvon to Sir Theophilus Shepstone—the present Commissioner of the Transvaal—that officer was directed not to annex the Transvaal unless he was satisfied that a clear majority of the inhabitants were in favor of the change. How far these instructions were sincerely intended it is impossible to say. At any rate, Sir Theophilus Shepstone entirely ignored them. He annexed the Transvaal in defiance of the protests of its inhabitants. This fact, however, was withheld from the knowledge of the British people. They were told that a majority of the Dutch residents had joyfully consented to the loss of their independence; and this falsehood having been propagated, it became necessary to conciliate the Boers at all hazards. There was only one way in which this could be done, and that was by attacking and destroying their old enemies, Sikukuni and the Zulus. The English had interfered in order to protect these Kaffirs from the Boers; they now were about to assail these Kaffirs in order to conciliate the Boers. When the Zulu king learned that the Transvaal had passed under British rule he was heartily rejoiced. It was, to his mind, tantamount to the disappearance of an inveterate foe, and the appearance in his stead of an old

and trusted friend. Now, at last, he thought, the justice he had waited for for fifteen years would be rendered to him. He little guessed the sort of man he had to do with in Sir Bartle Frere. This gentleman is a distinguished partisan of the High Church Party—a man prominent at missionary meetings, a defender of Christianity—one whose unctuous piety has been the main lever which has raised him to eminence. And this is the way he put the question in dispute between the Boers and the Zulus in a despatch to the Colonial Secretary:

"The Boers had force of their own, and every right of conquest; but they had also what they seriously believed to be a higher title, in the old commands they found in parts of their Bible to exterminate the Gentiles and take their land in possession. We may freely admit that they misinterpreted the text, and were utterly mistaken in its application. But they had at least a sincere belief in the Divine authority for what they did, and, therefore, a far higher title than the Zulus could claim for all they acquired."

This remarkable excursion into the regions of theology is dated November 16, 1878, and requires explanation. Sir Bartle Frere's fixed policy, as also that of his subordinate, Sir T. Shepstone, was to make war on the Zulus, and in the boundary disputes between them and the Boers it was hoped that a sufficient pretext had been found. Until he became Commissioner of the newly-annexed Transvaal, Sir T. Shepstone had always held that in these disputes the right was on the side of the Zulus. After the annexation he became a convert to the opposite faith, and reported that he was in possession of evidence "the most incontrovertible and overwhelming" to establish the justice of all that the Boers demanded. Not a tittle of this evidence was forthcoming at the time, nor has a tittle been produced since. The statement was, in fact, a fabrication in order to pave the way for a rupture with the Zulus. Sir Bartle Frere, however, appears to have been deceived by the solemn effrontery with which it was made, and to have agreed in consequence to the proposition of Sir Henry Bulwer, the Governor of Natal, to appoint an English commission to investigate the whole matter on the spot. The result of this investigation was an award wholly in the favor of the Zulus; and Sir Bartle Frere, to his profound disgust, found himself without any *casus belli* against the Zulus of a more sufficing character than the Boer belief that they had a divine commission authorizing their extermination and the appropriation of their lands. To the devout mind of the British High Commissioner, however, this was enough; and in making the award known to the envoys of Ketchwayo, Sir Bartle Frere coupled it with an ultimatum to the effect that if the Zulu army was not disbanded within thirty days their territory would be invaded. Hence the war. Lord Beaconsfield and his colleagues disclaim all responsibility for this ultimatum, but their disclaimer is one which requires to be established by evidence stronger than their unsupported assertions.

In addition to the history of the origin of the Zulu war, Miss Colenso's book contains a clear and instructive account of the military operations, and especially of the defeat at Isandlwana. This account, if accurate, is utterly destructive of the reputation of Lord Chelmsford, the British general, and it is not a little strange that it should have been received so quietly in England.

The Extravanzas of J. R. Planché, Esq. (Somerset Herald), 1825-1871. Edited by T. F. Dillon Croker and Stephen Tucker (Rouge Croix). 5 vols. 8vo. (London: Samuel French; New York: S. French & Son. 1880. Testimonial edition.)—After having written nearly two hundred plays or parts of plays, all of which have been acted, the first of them in 1818, and the latest and, as it proved, the last in 1871, the late Mr. Planché survived, at the age of eighty-three, to see this testimonial edition of a selection of his brightest and best work safely through the press and in the hands of the subscribers. Mr. Planché had various claims to regard and consideration. He was the author of some of the neatest little plays in our language, including the "Loan of a Lover," "Faint Heart never won Fair Lady," and the "Captain of the Watch." He was the reformer of costume on the English stage, for it was almost wholly owing to his efforts and his researches that historical heroes appeared in the habit they wore when in the flesh, and made use of weapons and armor and other properties like to those they actually had under their hands. He gave us one of the most amusing of all books of theatrical reminiscence, published in two volumes in England, and immediately condensed here to fill about a third of one of Mr. R. H. Stoddard's "Bric-à-Brac Series." And more important still, though he was not strictly the inventor of any of them, he may be said to have enriched our theatrical literature with three new dramatic forms—the classical extravaganza, the fairy spectacle, and the French *revue de fin d'année* (which he transplanted into British

soil with fair success). Classing all these three types together as "extravaganzas," the editors have picked out for the present volumes forty-five of the most successful and most characteristic, and it would be difficult to find anywhere in the works of any author so many light-some little pieces, marked by taste and innocence, point and purity, a playful fancy, a nimble vivacity, and, above all, unflagging *esprit*. Here are the "Invisible Prince" and the "Yellow Dwarf," the models of what dramatized fairy tales may be; here are "The Birds" of Aristophanes and the "Golden Fleece"; and here are "Mr. Buckstone's Ascent of Mount Parnassus" and "Success, or a Hit if you like it," skilful attempts to acclimatize in England the French *revue*, with its songs and hits at the times and at the other theatres. The most of these forty-five little pieces of pleasantry are written in rhyme. To each piece Mr. Planché prefixed a note setting forth the circumstances of its origin and performance. He also appended such foot notes as might be necessary to explain the many ephemeral allusions with which the text of burlesque and *revue* of necessity bristles. The five volumes are adorned with seventeen neat lithographic portraits, of Mr. Planché himself at the ages of thirty-nine and eighty-three; of Mr. Charles Dance, his collaborator in writing the earlier extravaganzas, and of the chief actors in the various pieces, including two of Robson, and one each of J. P. Harley, Mme. Vestris, Charles Mathews, and J. B. Buckstone. To the list of *dramatis personæ* at the head of each play are attached the names of the actors taking part in the performances. In the fifth volume the editors print a list of all Mr. Planché's dramatic pieces, drawn up with his assistance, and giving the place and date of first performance. They number 176, of which 72 were original, 10 of them being written in collaboration with Charles Dance, and the remaining 104 either alterations of old English plays or adaptations from foreign languages. It is to be regretted that in the case of these last the foreign original was not always clearly pointed out.

Free Land and Free Trade. The Lessons of the English Corn Laws applied to the United States. By Samuel S. Cox. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1880.)—The sub-title indicates the plan and intention of Mr. Cox's little book: he wants to point the moral of the English experience of free trade since 1846 for the American people. Those chapters which bear directly on this subject are interesting and valuable. If any one can write anything on that subject which will be read, and will really touch the convictions of the people about free trade, he does well to try. As for free land, what Mr. Cox says about it refers to Ireland and the Irish land question. We do not see the proper connection between this subject and the other. "Free land and free trade" makes a taking title, and we are by no means disposed to deny that there is a true connection between the two, if the obscurity as to what is meant by "free land" can be cleared up; but what has the Irish land question to do with the correction of American protectionism? The Irish land question is so difficult that we may gladly leave it to those who are forced to deal with it, and we cannot gain anything for the solution of our own problems by drawing into the solution another problem so difficult as that presented in Ireland.

Another reflection which has been suggested to us by reading Mr. Cox's book is this: Is it not remarkable that a member of Congress should take up the methods of the journalist, scholar, or agitator, and abandon the opportunities which his position affords him for winning practical results? Is there not something very significant in this fact, both for the free-trade controversy and for our political methods? The strength of protection now is not in the faith and will of the people. The people are ignorant or they are sceptical about protection. The strength of protection is in the lobby of Congress and in the personal interests of members of Congress. The writers and speakers who work for free trade by public agitation find that their efforts are ineffectual because they never reach the real sources of protectionist strength. They can, at best, create a conviction of the folly of protection in the minds of a large, unorganized mass of people, who suffer by protection, but who are mulcted in only small amounts each, while they are so occupied with their affairs that they cannot spare time to organize and defend themselves. The protected interests, on the other hand, are few, greatly interested, closely organized, and in direct connection with the legislature. Would it not seem, then, that a free-trader who is a member of Congress is right in the heart of the battle, where he can do all that can be done anywhere on behalf of free trade?

Nevertheless, we can easily understand why Mr. Cox should turn aside to work upon public opinion. Probably no one knows better than

he does the strength of the protectionist phalanx, the ramifications of its alliances, the perfection of its discipline, and the solidity of its entrenchments. He knows also the weakness of the opposing party. One party is based upon self-interest; the other on scientific conviction. One is profiting by an old political abuse; the other is preaching a reform which would, at best, cost trouble and worry and change of habits. The Congressman on the free-trade side, being thus overmatched in the immediate contest, seeks recruits. He wants a strong public opinion to support him. He cannot dislodge vested abuses, even if he form one of a majority, unless this earnest support is behind him. There is food for reflection here as to the theory of government which looks for initiative and impulse to the great mass of the people, while public men wait to be pushed or ordered; but we pass that by. As things are, we recognize the need for the course taken by Mr. Cox and the propriety of it. Whenever the old and faded issues of the war die out, so that the public can no longer be cajoled by reference to them and politicians can no longer avoid the trouble of thinking and acting on new questions by repeating the old party cries, there will be a chance for a fruitful agitation of the tariff question, and it will be well to have a good body of literature ready.

Notes d'un Globe-Trotter. Course autour du monde. Par Émile d'Audiffret. (Paris: E. Plon & Cie.; New York: F. W. Christern. 1880. 16mo, pp. 378.)—*Some Things in America*, set forth in Thirteen Letters. By Charles Waring. (London: Ridgway. 1880. Pp. 78.)—M. d'Audiffret started from Paris in August, 1878, taking the Suez and East India route, reached Yokohama in October, and established himself in Japan for the next three months, securing a house, not without difficulty, in Tokio. The more important part of his notes is that which describes his residence in the Japanese capital. During that time he studied the government and the manners of the people with some care, and with the advantages of wealth and social position, and he adds a few new points to our knowledge of the country. His account of the marriage customs of Japan, customs which have been frequently misrepresented, is especially curious. For the rest, the book has all the faults and the merits of a hasty and vivacious traveller's way of looking at things. Between January 28 and May 26 of last year M. d'Audiffret completed the homeward tour by crossing the Pacific, making the overland trip from San Francisco to New York and Philadelphia, where he spent "deux mois charmants," and taking the steamer to Havre. While he is *en route* his sketches are superficial enough, and often inaccurate—as, for instance, his account of the Stewart obsequies—and he appears to have been made the victim of one or two innocent deceptions at the hands of his club friends. But he is diffident about generalizing, and for the most part describes only what he actually saw, which he does in a lively and eminently readable manner.

A little later in the same year Mr. Charles Waring came to this country, and he has reprinted the letters which he wrote home to *Vanity Fair*, and in which he manages to misunderstand or misstate nearly everything he saw or heard. Perhaps the date of his visit may account for this in part, for in the early autumn months he may very well have found the towns empty and really believed that nobody ever rode or drove in private vehicles. This generalization is of a piece with his other inferences. Mr. Waring declares that the people here are not amusing; are all on the same model and the same level; that the refined moral and artistic satisfactions of life are lacking; that there is no contrast of rich and poor; that dramatic and comic elements are entirely wanting; that there is no fun, no pleasantry, no gayety in society, and no laughter, no merriment amongst the people. He saw no idlers or loafers, no soldiers, and no drunken men, heard no laughter or blasphemy, and witnessed no hilarity—which leads him to infer that the grim humorous stories which pass for Americanisms are of European manufacture, and would scarcely be allowed here unless taxed by the high protective duties charged on all imported goods. Very much in the same spirit he discusses religion and churches, harvests and American meat supplies, railroads and freight charges, free-trade and protection. Naturally enough, his picture is not only less agreeable than M. d'Audiffret's, but is less truthful, and he really gives less absolute information than the Frenchman, who has only a tithe of his technical knowledge.

Geodesy. By Colonel A. R. Clark, C.B. (London and New York: Macmillan & Co.)—One of the greatest wants in English scientific literature is that of manuals intermediate in grade between the ordinary textbooks of the schools and the discussions in periodical and learned societies. In this country, or in England, a student who has creditably completed the most advanced technical course in our colleges and high-

schools may be entirely unable to understand those discussions of his own subjects which he will meet with in the more advanced literature referred to. To fill the gap he must have recourse to French or German works, as he will be almost certainly unable to find what he wants in English. If Captain Clark's book does not entirely fulfil these wants for the student of geodesy it is because the subject is too extensive to be treated in a single volume. If we had to embody the author's idea in preparing the book in a single condensed statement, we might say that it was to present the beginner in geodesy with the first elements of nearly everything relating to the subject which he would be required to know. The ground covered is, in consequence, so wide as to make the manual typical of those prepared to be "cramped" by the candidate for the civil service. This, however, must not be taken for a reproach so much as for an illustration of the impossibility of adequately presenting every branch of the subject.

We can present to the student the best idea of what he will find in the book by describing the subject-matter and treatment of the principal chapters. The first thirty-six pages are devoted to "geodetical operations," but are really a condensed history of the geodesy of the last two centuries. Perhaps we should be a little more accurate in saying that it is a résumé of the more important geodetic operations during that interval, as no such fulness or continuity as we should have in a history is possible. We next have chapters on spherical trigonometry and the method of least squares. These are most suggestive of a manual for cramming, because they are devoted to subjects amply treated in text-books which are accessible to all. The treatment of spherical trigonometry is so excellent as to make us wish to see a full treatise on the same plan; yet we cannot but doubt the advisability of devoting space in the book to what the student ought to know before he begins the study. It is when the theory of the figure of the earth is reached that the difficulties to be contended with are most fully seen. In complete incongruity with what precedes, the author here presupposes on the part of the student a knowledge of the higher mathematics which he can hardly be expected to possess unless he has already studied them in very advanced treatises. Where shall we look for a student who has yet to learn spherical trigonometry but is nevertheless the master of the integral calculus and the theory of potentials? The connected subjects of spheroidal triangles and geodetic lines complete the purely theoretical part of the work. The seventh and eighth chapters are devoted to practical operations of geodesy. This is followed by fifty pages devoted to the calculation and adjustment of triangulation, and is followed by the calculation of latitudes and longitudes determined geodetically, the heights of stations, and the connection of geodetic and astronomical observations. The concluding chapters are upon the figure of the earth as determined by measurement and by the pendulum, and furnish the student with suggestive examples of the methods of calculation.

From this description it will be seen that the principal defect of the book is the want of homogeneous and systematic treatment. Many of the chapters, to be adequately treated, would require a volume as large as Captain Clark's whole book. It might be difficult to put into a single volume a fuller collection of things which a young man entering upon a geodetic survey ought to know, yet we should have liked to see a different style of treatment adopted. Special and narrow lines of investigation are followed out, to the great detriment of that breadth of treatment which would have given the student material for continuing his studies in other works.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Authors.—Titles.	Publishers.—Prices.
Adkins (Rev. E.), <i>The Ages to Come</i>	(Authors' Publishing Co.)
Arr (E. H.), <i>New England Bygones</i>	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.)

Dobson's Vignettes in Rhyme.

With an Introduction by E. C. Stedman. Square 12mo, gilt, \$2.

Mrs. Brassey's Sunshine and

Storm in the East. 8vo, illustrated, \$3.

Cox's Popular Romances of

the Middle Ages. Large 12mo, \$2.25.

HENRY HOLT & CO., NEW YORK.

Good Books for Summer Reading.

BAYARD TAYLOR'S CRITICAL ESSAYS. 8vo, \$2 25.

BAYARD TAYLOR'S GERMAN LITERATURE. 8vo, \$2 25.

MATHEW'S BUNDLE OF PAPERS. 16mo, \$1 25.

THE KNICKERBOCKER NOVELS. (8 vols. ready) 60 cents and \$1 25.

Arnold (H. P.), <i>Gleanings from Fontresna and the Upper Engadine</i>	(Houghton, Mifflin & Co.) \$1 25
Bache (R. M.), <i>Under the Palm-tree</i> , swd.....	(Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger)
Boggs (R.), <i>After Many Years: a Tale</i>	(Authors' Publishing Co.)
Bowser (E. S.), <i>Elementary Treatise on Analytic Geometry</i>	(D. Van Nostrand)
Prougton (Rhoda), <i>Second Thoughts</i> , 2 vols., swd.....	(D. Appleton & Co.) 40
Furnz (Eliza B.), <i>The Liberal Hymn-book</i>	(Burns & Co.)
Calvert (A.), <i>Virgil's Æneid, Book V</i>	(Henry Holt & Co.) 10
Daphne: a Tale.....	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.) 1 25
Denslow (V. P.), <i>Modern Thinkers</i>	(Pelford, Clarke & Co.)
Finley (Martha), <i>Elsie's Widowhood: a Tale</i>	(Lodd, Mead & Co.) 1 25
Gabrielan (E.), <i>Monseigneur Lecocq, swd</i>	(Estes & Lauriat)
Gravler (G.), <i>Etude sur une Carte inconnue de Louis Joliet, swd</i>	(Naisonneuve & Cie)
Greville (H.), <i>Lucie Rodey, swd</i>	(T. B. Peterson & Bros.) 10
Grove (G.), <i>Dictionary of Music and Musicians, Part 10, swd</i>	(Macmillan & Co.)
Gutmann (Dr. E.), <i>Watering Places of Germany, Austria, and Switzerland</i>	(D. Appleton & Co.)
Hausser (W. A.), <i>The Fabulous Gods denounced in the Bible</i>	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.)
Helprin (M.), <i>Historical Poetry of the Ancient Hebrews, Vol. II</i>	(D. Appleton & Co.)
Herbert (H. W.), <i>The Roman Traitor</i>	(T. B. Peterson & Bros.) 1 25
Holiday Rambles in Ordinary Places.....	(Macmillan & Co.) 1 25
Holland (Prof. T. E.), <i>Elements of Jurisprudence</i>	" " 2 10
Huth (A. H.), <i>Life and Writings of Henry Thomas Buckle</i>	(D. Appleton & Co.)
Huxley (Prof. T. H.), <i>Introductory to the Science Primers</i>	" " "
Independent Movement in New York, swd.....	(G. P. Putnam's Sons) 10
Isaac (P. L.), <i>Historical Notes on Shipping</i>	(A. Williams & Co.) 1 00
Jackson (Dr. J. D.), <i>The Black Arts in Medicine</i>	(Robert Clarke & Co.) 1 00
Koch (J.), <i>Ausgewählte kleinere Dichtungen Chaucer's, swd</i>	(Wilhelm Friedrich)
Lamb (Mrs. M. J.), <i>History of the City of New York, Vol. II, Part 8, swd</i>	(A. S. Barnes & Co.) 20
Legend of St. Olaf's Kirk, swd.....	(Estes & Lauriat)
Met cook (Rev. H. C.), <i>Natural History of the Agricultural Ant of Texas</i>	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.)
Martin (Mrs. C. B.), <i>Illustrated Guide-Book for Mt. Desert, 2d ed.</i>	(Loring, Short & Barnum) 75
Major Jones's Georgia Scenes, swd.....	(T. B. Peterson & Bros.) 75
Major Jones's Travels, swd.....	" " 75
Malot (H.), <i>No Relations: a Tale</i>	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.) 1 25
Martin (T.), <i>Life of H.R.H. the Prince Consort, Vol. V</i>	(D. Appleton & Co.)
May (Mattie), <i>Ethel Dutton, swd</i>	(A. K. Loring) 50
Metcalf (T.) and De Garmo (C.), <i>Scheme of Dictionary Work for Common Schools</i>	(Maxwell & Co.)
Metcalf (E.), <i>The Englishman and the Scandinavian</i>	(Trübner & Co.)
Mitchell (Dr. S. W.), <i>Hephzibah Guinness, and Other Stories</i>	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.) 1 25
Moore (J. J.), <i>Outlying Europe and the Nearer Orient</i>	" " "
Ode of Life.....	(Roberts Bros.) 1 00
Pearse (J. B.), <i>Graded Selections for Memorizing</i>	(Van Antwerp, Braug & Co.)
Pervanoglu (Dr. J.), <i>Culturbilder aus Griechenland, swd</i>	(W. Friedrich) 1 25
Raimond (G.), <i>A New Race: a Tale</i>	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.) 1 25
Rees (J. R.), <i>Horace Vernet, Paul Delaroche</i>	(Scribner & Welford) 1 25
Renouf (P. Le P.), <i>Religion of Ancient Egypt</i>	(Chas. Scribner's Sons) 1 20
Republic of Republics.....	(Philadelphia)
Ridding (W. H.), <i>Stray Moments with Thackeray</i>	(D. Appleton & Co.)
Rollo's Journey to Cambridge, 2d ed.....	(A. Williams & Co.) 30
Roosa (Dr. D. B. St. J.) and Ely (Dr. E. T.), <i>Ophthalmic and Otic Contributions</i>	(G. P. Putnam's Sons)
Savage (Rev. M. J.), <i>The Morals of Evolution</i>	(Geo. H. Ellis)
Schlieff (E.), <i>Verfassung der Nordamerikanischen Union, swd</i>	(L. W. Schmidt)
Shaffer (Dr. N. M.), <i>The Hysterical Element in Orthopaedic Surgery</i>	(G. P. Putnam's Sons) 1 00
Shuckburgh (E. S.), <i>Selections from Ovid</i>	(Henry Holt & Co.) 50
Smith (W. E.), <i>The Recent Depression of Trade</i>	(Trübner & Co.)
Stoddard (R. H.), <i>Poems</i>	(Chas. Scribner's Sons) 4 00
Stone (Mrs. B. P.), <i>After the Pattern</i>	(Cong. Pub. Soc.)
Swinnburne (A. C.), <i>Songs of the Springtides</i>	(R. Worthington)
Taneyhill (R. H.), <i>The Leatherwood God, swd</i>	(Robert Clarke & Co.) 50
Taylor (B.), <i>Critical Essays and Literary Notes</i>	(G. P. Putnam's Sons) 2 25
Theodora; or, Star by Star.....	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.)
Three Friends' Fancies: Poetry.....	" " "
Trowbridge (Catherine M.), <i>Mistakes</i>	(Cong. Pub. Soc.)
Uncle Jack's Executors, swd.....	(G. P. Putnam's Sons) 60
Vapereau (G.), <i>Dictionnaire Universel des Contemporains, 4th ed., Parts I, II, swd</i>	(F. W. Christern)
Verderborps: a Novel.....	(Charles M. Hertig)
Ward (R.), <i>The Constitution of the Earth</i>	(George Bell & Sons)
Ward (T. B.), <i>The English Feets, 2 vols</i>	(Macmillan & Co.) 3 10
Wheeler (Prof. C. G.), <i>Elementary Guide to Determinative Mineralogy</i>	(S. J. Wheeler) 1 00
Williams (F. H.), <i>The Princess Elizabeth</i>	(Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger) 1 25
Winchell (Prof. A.), <i>Pseudamites</i>	(S. C. Griggs & Co.) 3 50
Wordsworth (Rev. C.), <i>Shakspere's Knowledge and Use of the Bible</i>	(Scribner & Welford) 2 25

THE TRANSATLANTIC SERIES. (2 vols. ready) 60 cts. and \$1 25.

Complete lists of Novels and of late publications sent on application.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS,

182 Fifth Avenue, New York.

The Immortal Life.

TEN ESSAYS BY JOHN WEISS. 12mo, cloth, 269 pages, price \$1 50.

Sold at all book-stores, and sent, post-paid, on receipt of price, by the publishers.

LOCKWOOD, BROOKS & CO., Boston.

To Summer Tourists.

ALLAN STEAMSHIP LINE.

From Baltimore to Halifax, and vice versa.

The A-1 British Royal Mail Iron Screw Steamships,
HIBERNIAN, 4,200 tons, Capt. Lieut. Archer, R.N.R.
NOVA SCOTIAN, 4,200 tons, Capt. Richardson,
CASSIAN, 4,000 tons, Capt. Trecks.

LEAVE BALTIMORE EVERY FORTNIGHT, WEDNESDAYS.

FOR HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA.

Cabin passage to Halifax, \$20 gold. Round Trip Ticket, \$34 gold.

This opportunity, by offering, as it were, an abbreviation of a European trip, is exceptionally agreeable to those who desire a change from the usual round of American pleasure resorts.

For further information apply to A. SCHUMACHER & CO.,
4 South Gay Street, Baltimore, Md.

TO SUMMER TOURISTS.

The New Illustrated Guide of the Lake Superior Transit Co.

FOR 1880

Now ready. Copies can be obtained of Ticket Agents of any of the trunk lines in New York, and of

T. P. CARPENTER, Gen. Pass. Agent, Buffalo, N. Y.

NORTH GERMAN LLOYD STEAMSHIP COMPANY

FOR SOUTHAMPTON AND BREMEN.

The Steamers of this Company will sail every Saturday from Bremen Pier, foot of Third Street, Hoboken.

RATES OF PASSAGE TO LONDON, HAVRE, AND BREMEN.

First Cabin, \$100; Second Cabin, \$60. Steerage, \$30. Prepaid Steerage Certificates, \$28.

For Freight or passage apply to

OELRICHS & CO., AGENTS,
2 Bowling Green.

GAS FIXTURES,

Fine Clocks and Bronzes,

PORCELAIN LAMPS,

AND

ORNAMENTAL METAL WORK.

NEWEST AND MOST DESIRABLE STYLES.

Exclusive Designs (if desired), specially adapted to furniture and decoration, unequalled in excellence of style and workmanship.

MITCHELL, VANCE & CO.,

836 and 838 Broadway, New York.

Pratt's Astral Oil.

PERFECTLY SAFE.

Especially adapted for use in the St. Germain Student Lamp.

CHAS. PRATT & CO.,

Box 3050.

NEW YORK.

NEW ENGLAND

MUTUAL

Life Insurance Co. of Boston.

Assets, \$15,131,240 65
Liabilities, 13,252,078 59

Total Surplus, \$1,879,162 06

BENJ. F. STEVENS, President.
JOS. M. GIBBENS, Secretary.

Natural Vichy Waters

FROM THE

ELIZABETH AND SAINTE-MARIE SPRINGS,
at Cusset, near Vichy, France.

Valuable for their therapeutic qualities. For sale everywhere. Circulars sent on request.

S. SANDERS NECK, SOLE IMPORTING AGENT,
180 Fulton Street, New York.

"HENRY GREVILLE'S" NEW BOOK

LUCIE RODEY.

A SOCIETY NOVEL.

BY HENRY GREVILLE.

Author of 'Doris', 'Savelli's Expiation', etc.

LUCIE RODEY. A New Society Novel. By Henry Greville, author of 'Doris', 'Savelli's Expiation', etc. Price 50 cents in paper, or \$1 in cloth.

HENRY GREVILLE'S OTHER BOOKS

DORIS! A Russian Love Story. By Henry Greville. Price 75 cents in paper cover, or \$1 25 in cloth.

SAVELLI'S EXPIATION. A Russian Story. By Henry Greville. Price 50 cents in paper, or \$1 in cloth.

SONIA! A Russian Love Story. By Henry Greville. Price 50 cents in paper cover, or \$1 in cloth.

MARRYING OFF A DAUGHTER. By Henry Greville. Price 75 cents in paper cover, or \$1 25 in cloth.

MARKOFF; THE RUSSIAN VIOLINIST. By Henry Greville. Paper cover, 75 cents; or cloth for \$1 50.

DOURNOF. A Russian Story. By Henry Greville. Price 50 cents in paper, or \$1 in cloth.

BONNIE-MARIE. A Tale of Normandy and Paris. By Henry Greville. 50 cents in paper, or \$1 in cloth.

PHILOMENE'S MARRIAGES. By Henry Greville. Price 75 cents in paper, or \$1 25 in cloth.

PRETTY LITTLE COUNTESS ZINA. A Russian Story. By Henry Greville. 75 cents in paper, or \$1 25 in cloth.

A FRIEND. ("L'Ami.") By Henry Greville. Price 50 cents in paper cover, or \$1 in cloth.

GABRIELLE; or, THE HOUSE OF MAURIZIO. By Henry Greville. Price 50 cents in paper, or \$1 in cloth.

* * The above books are for sale by all booksellers, or copies will be sent to any one, prepaid, upon remitting price to

T. B. PETERSON & BROTHERS,
No. 3/6 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

F. W. CHRISTERN,

Foreign Bookseller and Importer, 37 West Twenty-third Street, New York.

The principal publications of Quatin, Charpentier, Dentu, Didot, Hachette, Calman Levy, etc., on hand; also complete sets of Tauchnitz's collection of British authors and Teubner's Greek and Latin Classics. New publications received from Paris and Leipzig as soon as issued.

New English Books

At 25 cents to the Shilling.

Sent, post-paid, direct from London, on receipt of price of publication in bankers' draft, currency, or post-office order.

The recent Custom-House and Post-Office Circulars permit all printed matter to be mailed to the United States with safety and economy, and the duty, if any, to be collected from addressees.

Stevens's Priced List of nearly 500 English, French, and German Periodicals, with fuller Announcement for supplying books by mail or freight, is distributed gratuitously by every public library in the United States, by Tice & Lynch, 34½ Pine Street, New York, and B. F. STEVENS, American Library and Literary Agent, 4 Trafalgar Square, Charing Cross, London, England.

The famous portable Bookcase of Lockwood, Brooks & Company, Boston, Mass., is not only portable but is a perfect and handsome piece of furniture for the library and drawing-room, and for descriptive circular and list.

GOODS from LORD & TAYLOR, New York, may be returned if found unsatisfactory when examined at home.

Vitalized Phosphates:
A Brain and Nerve Food.

THIS DIFFERS FROM ALL OTHER TONICS BECAUSE IT IS COMPOSED OF THE VITAL OR NERVE-GIVING PRINCIPLES OF THE OX BRAIN AND WHEAT GERM.

It strengthens the digestion and restores to the brain and nerves the elements that have been carried off by disease, worry, or overwork. It revitalizes weakly children.

For sale by druggists, or by mail \$1.

F. CROSBY, 666 Sixth Avenue, New York.

MACMILLAN & Co.'s
NEW PUBLICATIONS.

A New English Anthology.

The English Poets.

Selections, with Critical Introductions by various Writers, and a General Introduction by MATTHEW ARNOLD. Edited by Thomas Humphry Ward, M.A.

Vol. I. Chaucer to Donne. 12mo, \$1 75.

Vol. II. Ben Jonson to Dryden. 12mo, \$1 75.

The aim of this book is to furnish in a convenient form a thoroughly representative selection of English poetry, from Chaucer to modern times, excluding the drama and the writings of living poets. The distinguishing feature is that the work of selection and criticism has been entrusted to a number of different writers, who have been chosen for their special acquaintance with the poets and the periods with which they deal. It is hoped that the book may thus claim a degree of authority which could not be claimed by any single writer who should attempt to cover the whole vast field of English poetry.

The distribution of the principal subjects is as follows:

Vol. I.—General Introduction, Matthew Arnold; Chaucer, the Editor; Piers Plowman, Prof. Skeat; Gower, Lydgate, and Occleve, F. Arnold; Early Scotch Poets, Prof. Nichol; W. E. Henley, etc.; English and Scotch Ballads, A. Lang; Early Sixteenth Century Poets, J. C. Collins; Sackville and Spenser, the Dean of St. Paul's; Sidney, Mrs. T. H. Ward; Shakespeare, Prof. Dowden; Minor Elizabethan Poets, A. C. Bradley, E. W. Gosse, Prof. Hales, A. Lang, W. Minto, G. Saintsbury, the Editor.

Vol. II.—Ben Jonson, Prof. A. W. Ward; Drummond of Hawthornden, the Editor; Beaumont and Fletcher, A. C. Bradley; Browne, Wither, and Habington, W. T. Arnold; Herrick, etc., E. W. Gosse; Herbert, Crashaw, etc., G. A. Simcox; Cowley, the Editor; Waller, Denham, etc., E. W. Gosse; Milton, Mark Pattison; Marvell, Goldwin Smith; Minor Restoration Poets, E. W. Gosse; Butler, W. E. Henley; Dryden, Prof. A. W. Ward.

Volumes III. and IV. will be ready shortly.

"The English Poets" promises to be altogether the most satisfactory anthology which has ever appeared. The critical introductions are worthy of more than passing notice. Nothing could be better than Prof. Dowden's essays upon the sonnets of Shakespeare, with the concluding paragraph on the songs; or Prof. A. W. Ward's estimate of Ben Jonson; or, to end what promises to be an exhaustive list, Mr. Gosse's fine essay upon Robert Herrick. The book is one to find its place in every library, and with its scholarly selections and ripe criticism, cannot but elevate the taste of the reader and lead him continually into fresh fields and pastures new."—*Boston Evening Traveller*.

"It is with no little pleasure, therefore, that we find a recently-published anthology to be, so far as our examination of it enables us to judge, as nearly satisfactory, in its selections and the accompanying essays, as anything of the sort can be. The editorial judgment shown in the compilation of the work seems to us to be supremely good."—*N. Y. Evening Post*.

An Introduction to the

Philosophy of Religion. By JOHN CAIRD, D.D., Principal and Vice-Chancellor of the University of Glasgow, and one of Her Majesty's Chaplains for Scotland. 8vo, \$3.

"A carefully-thought-out, valuable treatment of the central point of human speculation, written in a flowing, full, elaborate, philosophical style, full of acute remarks, breathing the spirit of Hegel and of modern science, including the theory of evolution, and holding fast to the distinctive doctrines of Christianity. It belongs to the class of works that mark a transition in religious thought."—*Independent*.

The Elements of Juris-

prudence. By THOMAS ERSKINE HOLLAND, D.C.L., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law, Chichele Professor of International Law and Diplomacy, and Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford. 8vo, \$2 50.

MACMILLAN & CO.,

22 Bond Street, New York.

